	Case 1:20-cv-01226-R	RGA Document 179-	<del>2 F</del>	ile	d 06/15/23 Page 1 of 15 PageID #:
1 89			93		3
			03:03:36	1	Ms. Morrison to sort of tell me where she thought some of
	1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE		03:03:43	2	the good information might be, and I would see if it was
	2 FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE 3		03:03:46	3	there.
	4 REGENXBIO INC. and THE TRUSTEES	)	03:03:48	4	So, as I understand it, the notes I made to
	OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ) 5 PENNSYLVANIA, )		03:03:58	5	myself here was that the Plaintiff's theory is that this
	6 Plaintiffs,	) )	03:04:03	6	agreement was relevant to the safe harbor and to damages.
	7 v.	) C.A. No. 20-1226-RGA	03:04:18	7	And as I sort of understood it, I think the response of the
	8 SAREPTA THERAPEUTICS, INC. and SAREPTA THERAPEUTICS THREE,	)	03:04:24	8	Defendant here was, We provided you with all the information
	9 LLC,	)	03:04:30	9	about all of the SRP-9001 that we made.
1	O Defendants.	)	03:04:45	10	Is that right, Ms. Morrison?
1		J. Caleb Boggs Courthouse	03:04:47	11	MS. MORRISON: I'm sorry, Your Honor. Is it
1		844 North King Street Wilmington, Delaware	03:04:50	12	THE COURT: No, that's all right. You can stand
1		Tuesday, May 2, 2023 3:00 p.m.	03:04:52	13	there for a second.
1		Discovery Dispute Conference	03:04:55	14	Basically, has the Defendant provided you,
1		G. ANDREWS, U.S.D.C.J.	03:04:57	15	Here's all the times we made SRP-9001 in the United States
1	7 APPEARANCES:		03:05:03	16	and presumably what we have done with it?
1	8 FISH & RICHARDSON BY: SUSAN MORRISON,	ECOULDE	03:05:05	17	MS. MORRISON: So, that is I believe it's not
1	The state of the s	_	03:05:08	18	a hundred percent correct, Your Honor. We still are having
2		iaintiii	03:05:11	19	a discussion about some batch records. I'm not the closest
2	1 MORRIS NICHOLS ARSHT BY: DEREK FAHNESTOC		03:05:14	20	to that issue on my team, but I believe there's still
2	-and-		03:05:17	21	discussion going on about whether there are some missing
2	QUINN EMANUEL URQUHA		03:05:19	22	batch records and whether we actually have all that
2		For the Defendant	03:05:24	23	information, but that's so, I think that's still up for
02:51:58	5	For the Derendant	03:05:29	24	debate. But I think the parties are working on that piece
			03:05:31		of it in terms of whether we have everything.
		2			4
02:51:58 <b>1</b>	*** PROCEEDING	2 GS ***	03:05:34	1	4 MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've
02:51:58 <b>1</b>	TROCLEDING	GS ***	03:05:34	1 2	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've
03:01:03 2	DEPUTY CLERK: All r	GS *** rise. Court is now in	03:05:36	2	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a
03:01:03 <b>2</b> 03:02:31 <b>3</b>	DEPUTY CLERK: All r session. The Honorable Richard	GS *** rise. Court is now in G. Andrews presiding.	03:05:36 03:05:41	3	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced
03:01:03 <b>2</b> 03:02:31 <b>3</b> 03:02:31 <b>4</b>	DEPUTY CLERK: All r session. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All righ	GS *** rise. Court is now in	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46	2 3 4	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.
03:01:03 <b>2</b> 03:02:31 <b>3</b> 03:02:31 <b>4</b> 03:02:33 <b>5</b>	DEPUTY CLERK: All r session. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All righ be seated.	GS *** rise. Court is now in G. Andrews presiding. at. Good afternoon. Please	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50	2 3 4 5	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some
03:01:03 <b>2</b> 03:02:31 <b>3</b> 03:02:31 <b>4</b> 03:02:33 <b>5</b> 03:02:35 <b>6</b>	DEPUTY CLERK: All right session. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated.  We're here in the Train	GS *** rise. Court is now in G. Andrews presiding. at. Good afternoon. Please	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53	2 3 4 5 6	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all
03:01:03 <b>2</b> 03:02:31 <b>3</b> 03:02:31 <b>4</b> 03:02:33 <b>5</b> 03:02:35 <b>6</b> 03:02:42 <b>7</b>	DEPUTY CLERK: All right session. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated.  We're here in the True Pennsylvania, et al. vs. Sarepta.	GS *** rise. Court is now in G. Andrews presiding. at. Good afternoon. Please sustee of the University of	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53 03:05:56	2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that
03:01:03 <b>2</b> 03:02:31 <b>3</b> 03:02:31 <b>4</b> 03:02:33 <b>5</b> 03:02:35 <b>6</b> 03:02:42 <b>7</b> 03:02:45 <b>8</b>	DEPUTY CLERK: All risession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated. We're here in the Trace Pennsylvania, et al. vs. Sarepta. Ms. Morrison, your cl	GS *** rise. Court is now in G. Andrews presiding. at. Good afternoon. Please	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53 03:05:56 03:06:00	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't
03:01:03 <b>2</b> 03:02:31 <b>3</b> 03:02:31 <b>4</b> 03:02:33 <b>5</b> 03:02:35 <b>6</b> 03:02:42 <b>7</b> 03:02:45 <b>8</b> 03:02:50 <b>9</b>	DEPUTY CLERK: All rightsession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated.  We're here in the True Pennsylvania, et al vs Sarepta.  Ms. Morrison, your cl their name?	rise. Court is now in  G. Andrews presiding.  at. Good afternoon. Please  sustee of the University of  dient, how do you pronounce	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53 03:05:56 03:06:00 03:06:04	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those
03:01:03 <b>2</b> 03:02:31 <b>3</b> 03:02:31 <b>4</b> 03:02:33 <b>5</b> 03:02:35 <b>6</b> 03:02:42 <b>7</b> 03:02:45 <b>8</b> 03:02:50 <b>9</b> 03:02:51 <b>10</b>	DEPUTY CLERK: All risession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated.  We're here in the True Pennsylvania, et al. vs. Sarepta.  Ms. Morrison, your cl. their name?  MS. MORRISON: It's	GS *** rise. Court is now in G. Andrews presiding. at. Good afternoon. Please ustee of the University of dient, how do you pronounce s Regenxbio.	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53 03:05:56 03:06:00 03:06:04	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the
03:01:03	DEPUTY CLERK: All rightsession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All rightsessession. We're here in the Trace Pennsylvania, et al. vs. Sarepta.  Ms. Morrison, your cl. their name?  Ms. MORRISON: It's THE COURT: Regenx	rise. Court is now in  G. Andrews presiding.  at. Good afternoon. Please  sustee of the University of  dient, how do you pronounce  s Regenxbio.	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53 03:05:56 03:06:00 03:06:04 03:06:08	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the
03:01:03	DEPUTY CLERK: All rightsession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated.  We're here in the 772 Pennsylvania, et al vs Sarepta.  Ms. Morrison, your clitheir name?  MS. MORRISON: It's THE COURT: Regenx MS. MORRISON: Regenx MS. MORRISON: Regenx	rise. Court is now in  G. Andrews presiding.  at. Good afternoon. Please  ustee of the University of  dilient, how do you pronounce  s Regenxbio.  abio?  genxbio.	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53 03:05:56 03:06:04 03:06:08 03:06:10	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the expiration of the patent.
03:01:03	DEPUTY CLERK: All rightsession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated.  We're here in the Trace Pennsylvania, et al. vs. Sarepta.  Ms. Morrison, your cl. their name?  MS. MORRISON: It's THE COURT: Regenx MS. MORRISON: Reg. THE COURT: Oh, oka	rise. Court is now in  G. Andrews presiding.  at. Good afternoon. Please  ustee of the University of  dilient, how do you pronounce  s Regenxbio.  abio?  genxbio.	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53 03:05:56 03:06:04 03:06:04 03:06:12 03:06:12	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the expiration of the patent.  THE COURT: And so, the stuff that was made as
03:01:03	DEPUTY CLERK: All risession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated. We're here in the Trace Pennsylvania, et al vs Sarepta. Ms. Morrison, your cl their name? MS. MORRISON: It's THE COURT: Regenx MS. MORRISON: Reg THE COURT: Oh, oka	rise. Court is now in  G. Andrews presiding.  at. Good afternoon. Please  sustee of the University of  dient, how do you pronounce  s Regenxbio.  abio?  genxbio.  ay.	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53 03:05:56 03:06:04 03:06:08 03:06:12 03:06:14 03:06:14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the expiration of the patent.  THE COURT: And so, the stuff that was made as of the expiration of the patent, Ms. Fernands, what happened
03:01:03	DEPUTY CLERK: All risession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated.  We're here in the Trace Pennsylvania, et al vs Sarepta.  Ms. Morrison, your cl their name?  MS. MORRISON: It's THE COURT: Regenx MS. MORRISON: Reg THE COURT: Oh, oka All right. All right. So, and I see Ms. Mo	rise. Court is now in  G. Andrews presiding.  At. Good afternoon. Please  Austee of the University of  Lilient, how do you pronounce  S Regenxbio.  Abio?  genxbio.  ay.	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53 03:05:56 03:06:04 03:06:10 03:06:12 03:06:14 03:06:16 03:06:27	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the expiration of the patent.  THE COURT: And so, the stuff that was made as of the expiration of the patent, Ms. Fernands, what happened to that stuff?
03:01:03	DEPUTY CLERK: All risession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated.  We're here in the Trac  Pennsylvania, et al vs Sarepta.  Ms. Morrison, your cl their name?  MS. MORRISON: It's THE COURT: Regenx MS. MORRISON: Reg THE COURT: Oh, oka All right. All right. So, and I see Ms. Mo And Mr. Fahnestock;	rise. Court is now in  G. Andrews presiding.  G. Good afternoon. Please  First State of the University of  G. Hient, how do you pronounce  G. Regenxbio.  Action of the University of  G. Hient, how do you pronounce  G. Regenxbio.  Action of the University of  G. Hient, how do you pronounce  G. Regenxbio.  Action of the University of  G. Hient, how do you pronounce  G. Regenxbio.  Action of the University of  G. Hient, how do you pronounce  G. Regenxbio.  Action of the University of  G. Hient, how do you pronounce  G. Regenxbio.  Action of the University of  G. Hient, how do you pronounce  G. Regenxbio.  Action of the University of  G. Hient, how do you pronounce  G. Regenxbio.  Action of the University of  G. Hient, how do you pronounce  G. Regenxbio.  Action of the University of  G. Hient, how do you pronounce  G. Regenxbio.  Action of the University of  G. Hient, how do you pronounce  G. Regenxbio.  Action of the University of  G. Hient, how do you pronounce  G. Regenxbio.  Action of the University of  G. Hient, how do you pronounce  G. Regenxbio.  Action of the University of  G. Hient, how do you pronounce  G. Regenxbio.  Action of the University of  G. Hient, how do you pronounce  G. Regenxbio.  Action of the University of  G. Hient, how do you pronounce  G. Regenxbio.  Action of the University of  G. Hient, how do you pronounce  G. Regenxbio.  Action of the University of  G. Hient, how do you pronounce  G. Hien	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53 03:05:56 03:06:04 03:06:08 03:06:12 03:06:14 03:06:14	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the expiration of the patent.  THE COURT: And so, the stuff that was made as of the expiration of the patent, Ms. Fernands, what happened
03:01:03	DEPUTY CLERK: All risession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated.  We're here in the Trace Pennsylvania, et al vs Sarepta. Ms. Morrison, your cl their name?  MS. MORRISON: It's THE COURT: Regenx MS. MORRISON: Reg THE COURT: Oh, oka All right. All right. So, and I see Ms. Mo And Mr. Fahnestock; And presumably, you	rise. Court is now in  G. Andrews presiding.  At. Good afternoon. Please  Austee of the University of  Lilient, how do you pronounce  S Regenxbio.  Abio?  genxbio.  ay.	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53 03:05:56 03:06:04 03:06:10 03:06:12 03:06:14 03:06:16 03:06:27	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the expiration of the patent.  THE COURT: And so, the stuff that was made as of the expiration of the patent, Ms. Fernands, what happened to that stuff?  MS. FERNANDS:
03:01:03	DEPUTY CLERK: All risession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated.  We're here in the Trace Pennsylvania, et al vs Sarepta. Ms. Morrison, your cl their name?  MS. MORRISON: It's THE COURT: Regenx MS. MORRISON: Reg THE COURT: Oh, oka All right. All right. So, and I see Ms. Mo And Mr. Fahnestock; And presumably, you his handwriting. You are?	rise. Court is now in  G. Andrews presiding.  At. Good afternoon. Please  Fustee of the University of  C.  Lilient, how do you pronounce  Se Regenxbio.  Abio?  genxbio.  ay.  Prrison there.  right?  If are I'm not sure about	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53 03:05:56 03:06:04 03:06:04 03:06:12 03:06:14 03:06:14 03:06:27 03:06:28	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the expiration of the patent.  THE COURT: And so, the stuff that was made as of the expiration of the patent, Ms. Fernands, what happened to that stuff?  MS. FERNANDS:
03:01:03	DEPUTY CLERK: All risession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated.  We're here in the Trace Pennsylvania, et al vs Sarepta.  Ms. Morrison, your cl their name?  MS. MORRISON: It's THE COURT: Regenx MS. MORRISON: Reg THE COURT: Oh, oka All right. All right. So, and I see Ms. Mo And Mr. Fahnestock; And presumably, you his handwriting. You are? MS. FERNANDS: Ms.	rise. Court is now in  G. Andrews presiding.  at. Good afternoon. Please  state of the University of  dient, how do you pronounce  s Regenxbio.  abio?  genxbio.  ay.  brrison there.  right?  u are I'm not sure about  . Fernands.	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53 03:05:56 03:06:04 03:06:10 03:06:12 03:06:14 03:06:16 03:06:27	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the expiration of the patent.  THE COURT: And so, the stuff that was made as of the expiration of the patent, Ms. Fernands, what happened to that stuff?  MS. FERNANDS:  there has been no approval yet. The BLA has been submitted and not approved. There's no commercial
03:01:03	DEPUTY CLERK: All risession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated.  We're here in the 772  Pennsylvania, et al vs Sarepta.  Ms. Morrison, your cl their name?  MS. MORRISON: It's THE COURT: Regenx MS. MORRISON: Reg THE COURT: Oh, oka All right. All right. So, and I see Ms. Mo And Mr. Fahnestock; And presumably, you his handwriting. You are?  MS. FERNANDS: Ms. THE COURT: Ms. Fer	rise. Court is now in  G. Andrews presiding.  At. Good afternoon. Please  Austee of the University of  Lilient, how do you pronounce  S Regenxbio.  Abio?  genxbio.  ay.  Arrison there.  right?  If are I'm not sure about  Fernands.  rnands?	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53 03:05:56 03:06:04 03:06:04 03:06:12 03:06:14 03:06:14 03:06:27 03:06:28	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 19 20	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the expiration of the patent.  THE COURT: And so, the stuff that was made as of the expiration of the patent, Ms. Fernands, what happened to that stuff?  MS. FERNANDS:
03:01:03	DEPUTY CLERK: All rightsession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated.  We're here in the Trace Pennsylvania, et al. vs. Sarepta.  Ms. Morrison, your cl. their name?  MS. MORRISON: It's THE COURT: Regenx Ms. MORRISON: Regenx Ms. MORRISON: Regenx Ms. MORRISON: Regenx Ms. Morrison, your cl. their name?  MS. MORRISON: Regenx Ms. Morrison, and I right. All right.  So, and I see Ms. Mo And Mr. Fahnestock; And presumably, you his handwriting. You are?  MS. FERNANDS: Ms. THE COURT: Ms. Fernands: Yes	rise. Court is now in  G. Andrews presiding.  At. Good afternoon. Please  Final Strate of the University of  G. Hient, how do you pronounce  G. Regenxbio.  Abio?  Genxbio.  Ay.  Forrison there.  Fright?  Forriands.  Fornands.  Franands?  G. Hient, how do you pronounce  Fernands.	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53 03:05:56 03:06:04 03:06:04 03:06:12 03:06:14 03:06:16 03:06:27 03:06:28	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 19 20 21	represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the expiration of the patent.  THE COURT: And so, the stuff that was made as of the expiration of the patent, Ms. Fernands, what happened to that stuff?  MS. FERNANDS:  there has been no approval yet. The BLA has been submitted and not approved. There's no commercial approval. And so, there are ongoing clinical trials, but,
03:01:03	DEPUTY CLERK: All rightsession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated.  We're here in the Trace Pennsylvania, et al. vs. Sarepta.  Ms. Morrison, your cl. their name?  MS. MORRISON: It's THE COURT: Regenx Ms. MORRISON: Regenx Ms. MORRISON: Regenx Ms. MORRISON: Regenx Ms. Morrison, your cl. their name?  MS. MORRISON: Regenx Ms. Morrison, and I right. All right.  So, and I see Ms. Mo And Mr. Fahnestock; And presumably, you his handwriting. You are?  MS. FERNANDS: Ms. THE COURT: Ms. Fernands: Yes	rise. Court is now in  G. Andrews presiding.  At. Good afternoon. Please  Austee of the University of  Lilient, how do you pronounce  S Regenxbio.  Abio?  genxbio.  ay.  Arrison there.  right?  If are I'm not sure about  Fernands.  rnands?	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:53 03:05:56 03:06:04 03:06:10 03:06:12 03:06:14 03:06:27 03:06:28 03:06:37	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 19 20	MS. FERNANDS: What we have and we've represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the expiration of the patent.  THE COURT: And so, the stuff that was made as of the expiration of the patent, Ms. Fernands, what happened to that stuff?  MS. FERNANDS:  there has been no approval yet. The BLA has been submitted and not approved. There's no commercial
03:01:03	DEPUTY CLERK: All rightsession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated.  We're here in the Trace Pennsylvania, et al. vs. Sarepta.  Ms. Morrison, your cl. their name?  MS. MORRISON: It's THE COURT: Regenx Ms. MORRISON: Regenx Ms. MORRISON: Regenx Ms. MORRISON: Regenx Ms. Morrison, your cl. their name?  MS. MORRISON: Regenx Ms. Morrison, and I right. All right.  So, and I see Ms. Mo And Mr. Fahnestock; And presumably, you his handwriting. You are?  MS. FERNANDS: Ms. THE COURT: Ms. Fernands: Yes	rise. Court is now in  G. Andrews presiding.  At. Good afternoon. Please  State of the University of  Client, how do you pronounce  S Regenxbio.  Abio?  genxbio.  ay.  Prrison there.  right?  If are I'm not sure about  Fernands.  Frands?  S.  ay. So, I read your letters,	03:05:36 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:50 03:05:56 03:06:00 03:06:04 03:06:12 03:06:14 03:06:27 03:06:28	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 19 20 21	represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the expiration of the patent.  THE COURT: And so, the stuff that was made as of the expiration of the patent, Ms. Fernands, what happened to that stuff?  MS. FERNANDS:  there has been no approval yet. The BLA has been submitted and not approved. There's no commercial approval. And so, there are ongoing clinical trials, but,
03:01:03	DEPUTY CLERK: All risession. The Honorable Richard THE COURT: All right be seated.  We're here in the Trace Pennsylvania, et al vs Sarepta. Ms. Morrison, your cl their name?  MS. MORRISON: It's THE COURT: Regenx MS. MORRISON: Reg THE COURT: Oh, oka All right. All right. So, and I see Ms. Mo And Mr. Fahnestock; And presumably, you his handwriting. You are? MS. FERNANDS: Ms. THE COURT: Ms. Fer MS. FERNANDS: Yes THE COURT: So, oka	rise. Court is now in  G. Andrews presiding.  At. Good afternoon. Please  Fustee of the University of  C. Lient, how do you pronounce  S. Regenxbio.  Abio?  genxbio.  ay.  Ferrison there.  right?  If are I'm not sure about  Fernands.  Frands?  S.  Bay. So, I read your letters,  ring along two unredacted	03:05:36 03:05:41 03:05:46 03:05:50 03:05:56 03:06:00 03:06:04 03:06:12 03:06:14 03:06:27 03:06:28	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 19 20 21 22 23	represented to Plaintiffs many times is we have produced a spreadsheet of all batches of SRP-9001 drug product produced prior to the expiration of the patent in November of 2012.  As Ms. Morrison has indicated, there are some batch records related to they have the spreadsheet of all final product produced. There are some batch records that the manufacturer has not released yet, so my client doesn't have them yet. And we represented that we'll provide those backup batch records as we receive them, but they have the spreadsheet of everything that has been made as of the expiration of the patent.  THE COURT: And so, the stuff that was made as of the expiration of the patent, Ms. Fernands, what happened to that stuff?  MS. FERNANDS:  there has been no approval yet. The BLA has been submitted and not approved. There's no commercial approval. And so, there are ongoing clinical trials, but,

<del>Page 2 of 15 PageID #</del> 94 1 1 None of it has ever been sent to Europe, or Japan or some 03:09:57 question that asks for your work product, so if you can't 2 other place outside the United States? 2 answer the question without disclosing things you don't want 03:10:03 03:07:10 3 3 03:07:12 MS. FERNANDS: I don't believe that there have 03:10:05 to disclose, just tell me. 4 4 and I believe there's But essentially can you account for all the 03:07:16 5 been some limited discovery, you know, emails as to that. 5 product that they've made? 03:10:10 03:07:20 6 MS. MORRISON: So, I'm not sure I can answer 03:07:24 6 But as far as the clinical trials, those were all run by 03:10:11 Sarepta, and that information would be with Sarepta, to the 7 that, Your Honor, but I can answer a slightly different 03:10:15 03:07:27 question which relates to the relevance of the agreement, if 03:07:32 8 extent it's being used for clinicals. 03:10:18 8 9 that's helpful. 03:10:23 03:10:24 10 THE COURT: You guys both want to get me back to 03:10:26 11 the agreement. Okay. Well, go ahead. Maybe that's a good 03:10:29 12 seque. 03:07:53 13 And so, I don't want to misrepresent that 03:10:29 13 MS. MORRISON: And I want to see if I can --03:10:31 14 14 nothing's been sent, but there's a trial called the 301 would it be helpful if I came to the podium? 03:07:56 15 03:10:33 15 THE COURT: I don't know. I can hear you fine trial that Sarepta is running that I believe is a global 03:07:59 16 trial, but it's a Sarepta trial for FDA submission. 03:10:35 16 from here. 03:08:02 03:08:06 17 THE COURT: Well, so maybe a slightly different 03:10:35 17 MS. MORRISON: As long as you can hear me and 03:08:09 18 way of asking the same question is essentially: Can you 03:10:37 18 the court reporter can, I'm happy to stay here. The 03:08:12 19 account for all the product that has been made? 03:10:39 19 agreement -- I think the real sticking point between the 03:08:14 20 MS. FERNANDS: I think I can account for -- I 03:10:42 20 parties, and I will say that Ms. Fernands and my team did 03:08:23 21 don't --03:10:45 21 try to work this out, and I think the real sticking point, 03:08:23 **22** 03:10:49 22 THE COURT: And when I say that, I don't mean and they did offer some unredacted version of the agreement, 23 you personally, of course. I mean --03:10:53 23 but the real sticking point is something called the joint 03:08:24 03:08:26 24 MS. FERNANDS: Right. 03:10:56 24 development -- excuse me, the global development plan. 03:08:26 **25** 03:10:59 25 THE COURT: -- in terms of the documentation And I think the issue is this, Your Honor: It's 1 that your company, your client, keeps. You know, they know 1 not so much about -- it is, in part, about what actually was 03:08:30 03:11:03 2 2 how much of it they've made. You've provided a spreadsheet made and what happened to it. That's part of the issue. 03:11:07 03:08:36 3 3 to that effect. But the other part of the issue, of course, is 03:08:38 03:11:11 Do they also know, you know, so much of it is 4 what the parties' expectations were as of the date of the 03:11:13 03:08:40 03:08:44 5 sitting in the warehouse, so much of it was sent off for a 03:11:17 5 hypothetical negotiation for damages purposes. 6 trial, so much of it, you know, went bad after sitting 6 THE COURT: Well, right. And so, that's a 03:08:47 03:11:20 7 around for a couple years and we destroyed it, and the 7 damages question. 03:11:22 03:08:52 8 amount we made is the same amount that we've now accounted 8 MS. MORRISON: Yes. 03:08:57 03:11:23 9 for? THE COURT: The questions I was asking really 03:11:23 03:09:01 03:09:01 10 MS. FERNANDS: Yes, I'm certain all of that 03:11:29 10 had to do with the safe harbor. And I think the way you 11 information exists, and we have tried to provide that in 03:11:34 11 wrote your letter, you started off with the safe harbor. 03:09:04 12 03:11:38 12 So, I started where you started. discovery, because not only did we provide what batches were 03:09:06 13 made, but we also provided a spreadsheet as to clinical 03:11:39 13 MS. MORRISON: Okay. 03:09:10 14 trials. Although that could, I think, be updated, but 03:11:39 14 THE COURT: But is the damages the more 03:09:13 03:09:17 15 there's a second large spreadsheet in the production as to 03:11:46 15 significant issue? 16 what was sent off for clinicals. 03:09:19 03:11:47 16 MS. MORRISON: I think at this point it perhaps 03:09:21 17 03:11:49 17 So, yes, that information could be put together is, Your Honor, because the damages issue -- so, our opening 03:09:24 18 as to what would happen. I think the relevant question here 03:11:54 18 expert reports for both parties were due this past Friday. 03:09:27 19 is that this agreement isn't going to speak to what happened 03:11:57 19 THE COURT: Okay. 03:09:29 **20** 03:11:58 20 MS. MORRISON: And so, our damages expert has 03:09:30 21 03:12:00 21 submitted his report or his opening report. He has a reply THE COURT: Yeah. So, I understand the question 03:09:34 22 I'm asking is not perhaps a hundred-percent germane to why 03:12:05 22 as well. And he relied, in part, on the redacted version of 03:09:38 23 we're here. 03:12:11 23 the Roche agreement that was produced that's also publicly 03:09:39 24 03:12:15 24 available. So, let me just ask Ms. Morrison: Do you know, 03:09:43 25 does your side sort of -- you know, I don't want to ask a 03:12:16 25 THE COURT: Right, because it was attached to a

	Case 1:20-cv-01226-RGA Document 179-		<del>d 06/15/23 Page 3 of 15 PageID #:</del>
		95	11
03:12:18 1	10K.	03:15:17	THE COURT: Okay.
03:12:18 2	MS. MORRISON: It was attached to a 10K. So, he	03:15:18 2	MS. MORRISON: And so I'm sorry, Your Honor.
03:12:20 3	had it, and they also produced that version. And so, he was	03:15:19 3	THE COURT: No, no, no. I thought you were
03:12:23 4	able to rely upon it.	03:15:23 4	pausing there.
03:12:25 5	And in that, he relied upon it because that	03:15:26 <b>5</b>	So, why don't we do this. Why don't I get
03:12:28 6	Roche agreement was signed just about, I believe	03:15:30 6	because you could probably point me to in the agreement
03:12:31 7	THE COURT: Right, right. I gather it was	03:15:33 7	where you think this stuff is that you'd like to have;
03:12:32	within a month or something.	03:15:37	right?
03:12:34	MS. MORRISON: Yes, very close to the time of	03:15:38	MS. MORRISON: I certainly can try, Your Honor.
03:12:36 10	the hypothetical negotiation. And so, it's highly relevant	03:15:40 10	THE COURT: All right. Well, before you try,
03:12:39 11	to the Sarepta negotiator's state of mind coming to the	03:15:42 11	can we get two redacted and two unredacted, one for me and
03:12:43 12	hypothetical negotiation about how important having a	03:15:49 12	one for my excellent assistant here?
03:12:45 13	license would be to Sarepta.	03:15:53 13	MS. FERNANDS: Okay. So, when Your Honor asked
03:12:47 14	And so, I can't tell Your Honor what is in the	03:15:54 14	for a highlighted, we actually highlighted the unredacted
03:12:53 15	global development plan because I haven't seen it, but that	03:15:58 15	with everything that is redacted.
03:12:57 16	is one area where Regenxbio's facts, we can do nothing more	03:15:59 16	THE COURT: Okay. So, in other words okay.
03:13:04 17	than suspect based on what's in the agreement. It's an	03:16:02 17	MS. FERNANDS: I think that might be
03:13:06 18	informed suspicion, I would say, that there are items in	03:16:04 18	THE COURT: Yeah, yeah. You know
03:13:09 19	that global development plan that would be relevant to the	03:16:05 19	MS. FERNANDS: I can also bring an unredacted or
03:13:12 <b>20</b>	damages analysis because it would inform Sarepta's position	03:16:08 <b>20</b>	a clean one.
03:13:16 21	coming to the hypothetical negotiation. And our damages	03:16:09 <b>21</b>	THE COURT: No, no. If it's yellow
03:13:20 <b>22</b>	expert did rely pretty extensively on the redacted version	03:16:10 22	MS. FERNANDS: It is I brought three
03:13:25 23	of the Roche agreement in his expert report.	03:16:14 23	different varieties, but I think that might be the most
03:13:29 <b>24</b>	And so, we do think it's I can't tell you	03:16:17 24	efficient way to see what was redacted.
03:13:33 <b>25</b>	what exactly is in these sections that we don't have, of	03:16:19 <b>25</b>	THE COURT: And so, the yellow is the stuff that
	10		12
03:13:36 <b>1</b>	10 course, but I can give you a suspicion of what might be	03:16:21 <b>1</b>	12 was redacted?
03:13:36 <b>1</b> 03:13:39 <b>2</b>		03:16:21 <b>1</b> 03:16:23 <b>2</b>	
	course, but I can give you a suspicion of what might be		was redacted?
03:13:39 2	course, but I can give you a suspicion of what might be there.	03:16:23	was redacted?  MS. FERNANDS: Was redacted from the public version, correct.  THE COURT: So, Ms. Morrison, where would you
03:13:39 <b>2</b> 03:13:39 <b>3</b>	course, but I can give you a suspicion of what might be there.  THE COURT: Well, so one of the things that was	03:16:23 <b>2</b> 03:16:24 <b>3</b>	was redacted?  MS. FERNANDS: Was redacted from the public version, correct.  THE COURT: So, Ms. Morrison, where would you like to direct me to and you better, I guess because the
03:13:39 <b>2</b> 03:13:39 <b>3</b> 03:13:41 <b>4</b>	course, but I can give you a suspicion of what might be there.  THE COURT: Well, so one of the things that was said in the letter and, of course, Sarepta went second, was	03:16:23 <b>2</b> 03:16:24 <b>3</b> 03:16:25 <b>4</b>	was redacted?  MS. FERNANDS: Was redacted from the public version, correct.  THE COURT: So, Ms. Morrison, where would you
03:13:39 <b>2</b> 03:13:39 <b>3</b> 03:13:41 <b>4</b> 03:13:53 <b>5</b> 03:13:55 <b>6</b> 03:14:00 <b>7</b>	course, but I can give you a suspicion of what might be there.  THE COURT: Well, so one of the things that was said in the letter and, of course, Sarepta went second, was there's a lot of other things in the global development or	03:16:23 <b>2</b> 03:16:24 <b>3</b> 03:16:25 <b>4</b> 03:16:27 <b>5</b> 03:16:32 <b>6</b> 03:16:35 <b>7</b>	was redacted?  MS. FERNANDS: Was redacted from the public version, correct.  THE COURT: So, Ms. Morrison, where would you like to direct me to and you better, I guess because the pagination you have is probably different than the pagination of the one I just got.
03:13:39 <b>2</b> 03:13:39 <b>3</b> 03:13:41 <b>4</b> 03:13:53 <b>5</b> 03:13:55 <b>6</b> 03:14:00 <b>7</b> 03:14:04 <b>8</b>	course, but I can give you a suspicion of what might be there.  THE COURT: Well, so one of the things that was said in the letter and, of course, Sarepta went second, was there's a lot of other things in the global development or in the agreement, and there were two things in particular. One of them was something like exon and the other was something else.	03:16:23 <b>2</b> 03:16:24 <b>3</b> 03:16:25 <b>4</b> 03:16:27 <b>5</b> 03:16:32 <b>6</b> 03:16:35 <b>7</b> 03:16:36 <b>8</b>	was redacted?  MS. FERNANDS: Was redacted from the public version, correct.  THE COURT: So, Ms. Morrison, where would you like to direct me to and you better, I guess because the pagination you have is probably different than the
03:13:39 2 03:13:39 3 03:13:41 4 03:13:53 5 03:13:55 6 03:14:00 7 03:14:04 8 03:14:06 9	course, but I can give you a suspicion of what might be there.  THE COURT: Well, so one of the things that was said in the letter and, of course, Sarepta went second, was there's a lot of other things in the global development or in the agreement, and there were two things in particular.  One of them was something like exon and the other was something else.  And that, in so many words, there's just a whole	03:16:23	was redacted?  MS. FERNANDS: Was redacted from the public version, correct.  THE COURT: So, Ms. Morrison, where would you like to direct me to and you better, I guess because the pagination you have is probably different than the pagination of the one I just got.  MS. MORRISON: It is. And what I have, Your Honor, are section numbers
03:13:39 2 03:13:39 3 03:13:41 4 03:13:53 5 03:13:55 6 03:14:00 7 03:14:04 8 03:14:06 9 03:14:13 10	course, but I can give you a suspicion of what might be there.  THE COURT: Well, so one of the things that was said in the letter and, of course, Sarepta went second, was there's a lot of other things in the global development or in the agreement, and there were two things in particular. One of them was something like exon and the other was something else.  And that, in so many words, there's just a whole lot of different things going on at once that have nothing	03:16:23	was redacted?  MS. FERNANDS: Was redacted from the public version, correct.  THE COURT: So, Ms. Morrison, where would you like to direct me to and you better, I guess because the pagination you have is probably different than the pagination of the one I just got.  MS. MORRISON: It is. And what I have, Your Honor, are section numbers  THE COURT: Right. So, go ahead.
03:13:39 2 03:13:39 3 03:13:41 4 03:13:53 5 03:13:55 6 03:14:00 7 03:14:04 8 03:14:06 9 03:14:13 10 03:14:24 11	course, but I can give you a suspicion of what might be there.  THE COURT: Well, so one of the things that was said in the letter and, of course, Sarepta went second, was there's a lot of other things in the global development or in the agreement, and there were two things in particular.  One of them was something like exon and the other was something else.  And that, in so many words, there's just a whole lot of different things going on at once that have nothing to do with the patent and the cultured cells. What in his	03:16:23	was redacted?  MS. FERNANDS: Was redacted from the public version, correct.  THE COURT: So, Ms. Morrison, where would you like to direct me to and you better, I guess because the pagination you have is probably different than the pagination of the one I just got.  MS. MORRISON: It is. And what I have, Your Honor, are section numbers  THE COURT: Right. So, go ahead.  MS. MORRISON: which are, in some senses,
03:13:39	course, but I can give you a suspicion of what might be there.  THE COURT: Well, so one of the things that was said in the letter and, of course, Sarepta went second, was there's a lot of other things in the global development or in the agreement, and there were two things in particular. One of them was something like exon and the other was something else.  And that, in so many words, there's just a whole lot of different things going on at once that have nothing to do with the patent and the cultured cells. What in his report or her report did your expert do about how did	03:16:23	MS. FERNANDS: Was redacted from the public version, correct.  THE COURT: So, Ms. Morrison, where would you like to direct me to and you better, I guess because the pagination you have is probably different than the pagination of the one I just got.  MS. MORRISON: It is. And what I have, Your Honor, are section numbers  THE COURT: Right. So, go ahead.  MS. MORRISON: which are, in some senses, partially. So, I'll start with the one there's quite a
03:13:39 2 03:13:39 3 03:13:41 4 03:13:53 5 03:13:55 6 03:14:00 7 03:14:04 8 03:14:06 9 03:14:13 10 03:14:24 11 03:14:31 12 03:14:36 13	course, but I can give you a suspicion of what might be there.  THE COURT: Well, so one of the things that was said in the letter and, of course, Sarepta went second, was there's a lot of other things in the global development or in the agreement, and there were two things in particular. One of them was something like exon and the other was something else.  And that, in so many words, there's just a whole lot of different things going on at once that have nothing to do with the patent and the cultured cells. What in his report or her report did your expert do about how did they address things like that?	03:16:23	MS. FERNANDS: Was redacted from the public version, correct.  THE COURT: So, Ms. Morrison, where would you like to direct me to and you better, I guess because the pagination you have is probably different than the pagination of the one I just got.  MS. MORRISON: It is. And what I have, Your Honor, are section numbers  THE COURT: Right. So, go ahead.  MS. MORRISON: which are, in some senses, partially. So, I'll start with the one there's quite a few, Your Honor, so I'm not sure how many of these you would
03:13:39	course, but I can give you a suspicion of what might be there.  THE COURT: Well, so one of the things that was said in the letter and, of course, Sarepta went second, was there's a lot of other things in the global development or in the agreement, and there were two things in particular.  One of them was something like exon and the other was something else.  And that, in so many words, there's just a whole lot of different things going on at once that have nothing to do with the patent and the cultured cells. What in his report or her report did your expert do about how did they address things like that?  MS. MORRISON: So, I think what you're referring	03:16:23	was redacted?  MS. FERNANDS: Was redacted from the public version, correct.  THE COURT: So, Ms. Morrison, where would you like to direct me to and you better, I guess because the pagination you have is probably different than the pagination of the one I just got.  MS. MORRISON: It is. And what I have, Your Honor, are section numbers  THE COURT: Right. So, go ahead.  MS. MORRISON: which are, in some senses, partially. So, I'll start with the one there's quite a few, Your Honor, so I'm not sure how many of these you would like me to
03:13:39 2 03:13:39 3 03:13:41 4 03:13:53 5 03:13:55 6 03:14:00 7 03:14:04 8 03:14:06 9 03:14:13 10 03:14:24 11 03:14:31 12 03:14:36 13 03:14:37 14 03:14:40 15	course, but I can give you a suspicion of what might be there.  THE COURT: Well, so one of the things that was said in the letter and, of course, Sarepta went second, was there's a lot of other things in the global development or in the agreement, and there were two things in particular. One of them was something like exon and the other was something else.  And that, in so many words, there's just a whole lot of different things going on at once that have nothing to do with the patent and the cultured cells. What in his report or her report did your expert do about how did they address things like that?	03:16:23	MS. FERNANDS: Was redacted from the public version, correct.  THE COURT: So, Ms. Morrison, where would you like to direct me to and you better, I guess because the pagination you have is probably different than the pagination of the one I just got.  MS. MORRISON: It is. And what I have, Your Honor, are section numbers  THE COURT: Right. So, go ahead.  MS. MORRISON: which are, in some senses, partially. So, I'll start with the one there's quite a few, Your Honor, so I'm not sure how many of these you would
03:13:39 2 03:13:39 3 03:13:41 4 03:13:53 5 03:13:55 6 03:14:00 7 03:14:04 8 03:14:06 9 03:14:13 10 03:14:24 11 03:14:31 12 03:14:31 12 03:14:31 14 03:14:40 15 03:14:44 16	course, but I can give you a suspicion of what might be there.  THE COURT: Well, so one of the things that was said in the letter and, of course, Sarepta went second, was there's a lot of other things in the global development or in the agreement, and there were two things in particular.  One of them was something like exon and the other was something else.  And that, in so many words, there's just a whole lot of different things going on at once that have nothing to do with the patent and the cultured cells. What in his report or her report did your expert do about how did they address things like that?  MS. MORRISON: So, I think what you're referring	03:16:23	was redacted?  MS. FERNANDS: Was redacted from the public version, correct.  THE COURT: So, Ms. Morrison, where would you like to direct me to and you better, I guess because the pagination you have is probably different than the pagination of the one I just got.  MS. MORRISON: It is. And what I have, Your Honor, are section numbers  THE COURT: Right. So, go ahead.  MS. MORRISON: which are, in some senses, partially. So, I'll start with the one there's quite a few, Your Honor, so I'm not sure how many of these you would like me to
03:13:39 2 03:13:39 3 03:13:41 4 03:13:53 5 03:13:55 6 03:14:00 7 03:14:04 8 03:14:06 9 03:14:13 10 03:14:24 11 03:14:31 12 03:14:36 13 03:14:40 15 03:14:40 15 03:14:46 17	course, but I can give you a suspicion of what might be there.  THE COURT: Well, so one of the things that was said in the letter and, of course, Sarepta went second, was there's a lot of other things in the global development or in the agreement, and there were two things in particular.  One of them was something like exon and the other was something else.  And that, in so many words, there's just a whole lot of different things going on at once that have nothing to do with the patent and the cultured cells. What in his report or her report did your expert do about how did they address things like that?  MS. MORRISON: So, I think what you're referring to is the portions of the agreement that relate to exon skipping and gene editing.  THE COURT: Okay. Yes.	03:16:23	was redacted?  MS. FERNANDS: Was redacted from the public version, correct.  THE COURT: So, Ms. Morrison, where would you like to direct me to and you better, I guess because the pagination you have is probably different than the pagination of the one I just got.  MS. MORRISON: It is. And what I have, Your Honor, are section numbers  THE COURT: Right. So, go ahead.  MS. MORRISON: which are, in some senses, partially. So, I'll start with the one there's quite a few, Your Honor, so I'm not sure how many of these you would like me to  THE COURT: Well, there's a magic to the number three.  MS. MORRISON: Okay.
03:13:39 2 03:13:39 3 03:13:41 4 03:13:53 5 03:13:55 6 03:14:00 7 03:14:04 8 03:14:06 9 03:14:13 10 03:14:24 11 03:14:31 12 03:14:37 14 03:14:40 15 03:14:41 16 03:14:46 17 03:14:48 18	course, but I can give you a suspicion of what might be there.  THE COURT: Well, so one of the things that was said in the letter and, of course, Sarepta went second, was there's a lot of other things in the global development or in the agreement, and there were two things in particular. One of them was something like exon and the other was something else.  And that, in so many words, there's just a whole lot of different things going on at once that have nothing to do with the patent and the cultured cells. What in his report or her report did your expert do about how did they address things like that?  MS. MORRISON: So, I think what you're referring to is the portions of the agreement that relate to exon skipping and gene editing.  THE COURT: Okay. Yes.  MS. MORRISON: So, frankly, those are and I	03:16:23	MS. FERNANDS: Was redacted from the public version, correct.  THE COURT: So, Ms. Morrison, where would you like to direct me to and you better, I guess because the pagination you have is probably different than the pagination of the one I just got.  MS. MORRISON: It is. And what I have, Your Honor, are section numbers  THE COURT: Right. So, go ahead.  MS. MORRISON: which are, in some senses, partially. So, I'll start with the one there's quite a few, Your Honor, so I'm not sure how many of these you would like me to  THE COURT: Well, there's a magic to the number three.  MS. MORRISON: Okay.  THE COURT: So, why don't you give me your best
03:13:39 2 03:13:39 3 03:13:41 4 03:13:53 5 03:13:55 6 03:14:00 7 03:14:04 8 03:14:06 9 03:14:13 10 03:14:24 11 03:14:31 12 03:14:36 13 03:14:40 15 03:14:40 15 03:14:46 17 03:14:48 18 03:14:50 19	course, but I can give you a suspicion of what might be there.  THE COURT: Well, so one of the things that was said in the letter and, of course, Sarepta went second, was there's a lot of other things in the global development or in the agreement, and there were two things in particular.  One of them was something like exon and the other was something else.  And that, in so many words, there's just a whole lot of different things going on at once that have nothing to do with the patent and the cultured cells. What in his report or her report did your expert do about how did they address things like that?  MS. MORRISON: So, I think what you're referring to is the portions of the agreement that relate to exon skipping and gene editing.  THE COURT: Okay. Yes.  MS. MORRISON: So, frankly, those are and I think we've already said this to Sarepta, those are parts of	03:16:23	MS. FERNANDS: Was redacted from the public version, correct.  THE COURT: So, Ms. Morrison, where would you like to direct me to and you better, I guess because the pagination you have is probably different than the pagination of the one I just got.  MS. MORRISON: It is. And what I have, Your Honor, are section numbers  THE COURT: Right. So, go ahead.  MS. MORRISON: which are, in some senses, partially. So, I'll start with the one there's quite a few, Your Honor, so I'm not sure how many of these you would like me to  THE COURT: Well, there's a magic to the number three.  MS. MORRISON: Okay.  THE COURT: So, why don't you give me your best three.
03:13:39 2 03:13:39 3 03:13:41 4 03:13:53 5 03:13:55 6 03:14:00 7 03:14:04 8 03:14:06 9 03:14:13 10 03:14:24 11 03:14:31 12 03:14:36 13 03:14:37 14 03:14:40 15 03:14:41 16 03:14:41 18 03:14:45 19 03:14:50 19	course, but I can give you a suspicion of what might be there.  THE COURT: Well, so one of the things that was said in the letter and, of course, Sarepta went second, was there's a lot of other things in the global development or in the agreement, and there were two things in particular.  One of them was something like exon and the other was something else.  And that, in so many words, there's just a whole lot of different things going on at once that have nothing to do with the patent and the cultured cells. What in his report or her report did your expert do about how did they address things like that?  MS. MORRISON: So, I think what you're referring to is the portions of the agreement that relate to exon skipping and gene editing.  THE COURT: Okay. Yes.  MS. MORRISON: So, frankly, those are and I think we've already said this to Sarepta, those are parts of the agreements that we don't we're not interested in,	03:16:23	MS. FERNANDS: Was redacted from the public version, correct.  THE COURT: So, Ms. Morrison, where would you like to direct me to and you better, I guess because the pagination you have is probably different than the pagination of the one I just got.  MS. MORRISON: It is. And what I have, Your Honor, are section numbers  THE COURT: Right. So, go ahead.  MS. MORRISON: which are, in some senses, partially. So, I'll start with the one there's quite a few, Your Honor, so I'm not sure how many of these you would like me to  THE COURT: Well, there's a magic to the number three.  MS. MORRISON: Okay.  THE COURT: So, why don't you give me your best three.  MS. MORRISON: All right. Let me look at the
03:13:39 2 03:13:39 3 03:13:41 4 03:13:53 5 03:13:55 6 03:14:00 7 03:14:04 8 03:14:06 9 03:14:13 10 03:14:24 11 03:14:31 12 03:14:31 12 03:14:40 15 03:14:40 15 03:14:41 16 03:14:41 17 03:14:42 18 03:14:50 19 03:14:53 20 03:14:57 21	course, but I can give you a suspicion of what might be there.  THE COURT: Well, so one of the things that was said in the letter and, of course, Sarepta went second, was there's a lot of other things in the global development or in the agreement, and there were two things in particular. One of them was something like exon and the other was something else.  And that, in so many words, there's just a whole lot of different things going on at once that have nothing to do with the patent and the cultured cells. What in his report or her report did your expert do about how did they address things like that?  MS. MORRISON: So, I think what you're referring to is the portions of the agreement that relate to exon skipping and gene editing.  THE COURT: Okay. Yes.  MS. MORRISON: So, frankly, those are and I think we've already said this to Sarepta, those are parts of the agreements that we don't we're not interested in, but and we would agree to not have those parts of the	03:16:23	MS. FERNANDS: Was redacted from the public version, correct.  THE COURT: So, Ms. Morrison, where would you like to direct me to and you better, I guess because the pagination you have is probably different than the pagination of the one I just got.  MS. MORRISON: It is. And what I have, Your Honor, are section numbers  THE COURT: Right. So, go ahead.  MS. MORRISON: which are, in some senses, partially. So, I'll start with the one there's quite a few, Your Honor, so I'm not sure how many of these you would like me to  THE COURT: Well, there's a magic to the number three.  MS. MORRISON: Okay.  THE COURT: So, why don't you give me your best three.  MS. MORRISON: All right. Let me look at the sections that were highlighted for me here.
03:13:39 2 03:13:39 3 03:13:41 4 03:13:53 5 03:13:55 6 03:14:00 7 03:14:04 8 03:14:06 9 03:14:13 10 03:14:24 11 03:14:31 12 03:14:36 13 03:14:37 14 03:14:40 15 03:14:40 15 03:14:41 16 03:14:42 17 03:14:41 18 03:14:50 19 03:14:51 20 03:14:57 21 03:15:02 22	course, but I can give you a suspicion of what might be there.  THE COURT: Well, so one of the things that was said in the letter and, of course, Sarepta went second, was there's a lot of other things in the global development or in the agreement, and there were two things in particular.  One of them was something like exon and the other was something else.  And that, in so many words, there's just a whole lot of different things going on at once that have nothing to do with the patent and the cultured cells. What in his report or her report did your expert do about how did they address things like that?  MS. MORRISON: So, I think what you're referring to is the portions of the agreement that relate to exon skipping and gene editing.  THE COURT: Okay. Yes.  MS. MORRISON: So, frankly, those are and I think we've already said this to Sarepta, those are parts of the agreements that we don't we're not interested in,	03:16:23	MS. FERNANDS: Was redacted from the public version, correct.  THE COURT: So, Ms. Morrison, where would you like to direct me to and you better, I guess because the pagination you have is probably different than the pagination of the one I just got.  MS. MORRISON: It is. And what I have, Your Honor, are section numbers  THE COURT: Right. So, go ahead.  MS. MORRISON: which are, in some senses, partially. So, I'll start with the one there's quite a few, Your Honor, so I'm not sure how many of these you would like me to  THE COURT: Well, there's a magic to the number three.  MS. MORRISON: Okay.  THE COURT: So, why don't you give me your best three.  MS. MORRISON: All right. Let me look at the
03:13:39 2 03:13:39 3 03:13:41 4 03:13:53 5 03:13:55 6 03:14:00 7 03:14:04 8 03:14:06 9 03:14:13 10 03:14:24 11 03:14:31 12 03:14:36 13 03:14:40 15 03:14:40 15 03:14:41 16 03:14:41 18 03:14:50 19 03:14:50 19 03:14:50 22 03:15:04 23	course, but I can give you a suspicion of what might be there.  THE COURT: Well, so one of the things that was said in the letter and, of course, Sarepta went second, was there's a lot of other things in the global development or in the agreement, and there were two things in particular. One of them was something like exon and the other was something else.  And that, in so many words, there's just a whole lot of different things going on at once that have nothing to do with the patent and the cultured cells. What in his report or her report did your expert do about how did they address things like that?  MS. MORRISON: So, I think what you're referring to is the portions of the agreement that relate to exon skipping and gene editing.  THE COURT: Okay. Yes.  MS. MORRISON: So, frankly, those are and I think we've already said this to Sarepta, those are parts of the agreements that we don't we're not interested in, but and we would agree to not have those parts of the	03:16:23	MS. FERNANDS: Was redacted from the public version, correct.  THE COURT: So, Ms. Morrison, where would you like to direct me to and you better, I guess because the pagination you have is probably different than the pagination of the one I just got.  MS. MORRISON: It is. And what I have, Your Honor, are section numbers  THE COURT: Right. So, go ahead.  MS. MORRISON: which are, in some senses, partially. So, I'll start with the one there's quite a few, Your Honor, so I'm not sure how many of these you would like me to  THE COURT: Well, there's a magic to the number three.  MS. MORRISON: Okay.  THE COURT: So, why don't you give me your best three.  MS. MORRISON: All right. Let me look at the sections that were highlighted for me here.  So, one that's missing we believe is partially redacted that's missing information would be
03:13:39 2 03:13:39 3 03:13:41 4 03:13:53 5 03:13:55 6 03:14:00 7 03:14:04 8 03:14:06 9 03:14:13 10 03:14:24 11 03:14:31 12 03:14:36 13 03:14:37 14 03:14:40 15 03:14:40 15 03:14:41 16 03:14:42 17 03:14:41 18 03:14:50 19 03:14:51 20 03:14:57 21 03:15:02 22	course, but I can give you a suspicion of what might be there.  THE COURT: Well, so one of the things that was said in the letter and, of course, Sarepta went second, was there's a lot of other things in the global development or in the agreement, and there were two things in particular.  One of them was something like exon and the other was something else.  And that, in so many words, there's just a whole lot of different things going on at once that have nothing to do with the patent and the cultured cells. What in his report or her report did your expert do about how did they address things like that?  MS. MORRISON: So, I think what you're referring to is the portions of the agreement that relate to exon skipping and gene editing.  THE COURT: Okay. Yes.  MS. MORRISON: So, frankly, those are and I think we've already said this to Sarepta, those are parts of the agreements that we don't we're not interested in, but and we would agree to not have those parts of the agreement because they're not particularly relevant. But	03:16:23	MS. FERNANDS: Was redacted from the public version, correct.  THE COURT: So, Ms. Morrison, where would you like to direct me to and you better, I guess because the pagination you have is probably different than the pagination of the one I just got.  MS. MORRISON: It is. And what I have, Your Honor, are section numbers  THE COURT: Right. So, go ahead.  MS. MORRISON: which are, in some senses, partially. So, I'll start with the one there's quite a few, Your Honor, so I'm not sure how many of these you would like me to  THE COURT: Well, there's a magic to the number three.  MS. MORRISON: Okay.  THE COURT: So, why don't you give me your best three.  MS. MORRISON: All right. Let me look at the sections that were highlighted for me here.  So, one that's missing we believe is

	Case 1:20-cv-01226-RGA Document 179-	<del>2 File</del>	d <del>06/15/23 Page 4 of 15 PageID #:</del>		
03:17:25	MS. MORRISON: And, Your Honor, if I might.	96 03:20:11 <b>1</b>	be doing together. But there's no way for us to know. And		
03:17:27 2	Ms. Fernands	03:20:15 2	these kinds of issues is why we've been requesting		
03:17:27 3	THE COURT: Hold on just one second.	03:20:18 3	production of the full agreement.		
03:17:28 4	MS. MORRISON: I was just going to ask	03:20:19 4	THE COURT: Okay. So, let me just check the		
03:17:31 5	Ms. Fernands if she has a fully redacted version. I don't	03:20:28 5	definitions here.		
	6 have a paper copy with me.		Now, we had a discovery dispute some time ago,		
03:17:34 7	THE COURT: Right. Got it.	03:21:17 <b>6</b> 03:21:27 <b>7</b>	and we were discussing stuff that occurred after the		
03:17:36	•	03:21:36	expiration of the patent. Do you remember what stuff we		
03:17:37	•		were discussing?		
03:17:39 10	- , - F -		MS. MORRISON: I believe, Your Honor, and I'm		
03:17:41 11	•		sure Ms. Fernands will correct me if I have it wrong, but I		
03:17:41 12	•		believe that we were discussing whether Sarepta needed to		
03:17:43 13	THE COURT: So, I'm just curious, Ms. Fernands.	03:21:48 <b>12</b> 03:21:53 <b>13</b>	produce its forecasts for sales of the ultimate gene therapy		
03:17:55 14	So, I'm looking at the Table of Contents under Article VIII,	03:22:01 14	product for after the expiration of the patent		
03:17:58 15	and there's in what I have and what's in the public version	03:22:07 15	THE COURT: Okay.		
03:17:58 13	an 8.4, and an 8.86 and an 8.8.	03:22:07 13	MS. MORRISON: as well as some other things.		
03:18:03 17	And when I look at the going to where	03:22:09 17	But I think that was the main event.		
03:18:08 17	Ms. Morrison's directed, I notice that there's an 8.5 and an	03:22:10 17	MS. FERNANDS: I think the main thrust was		
03:18:18 19	8.7. And I'm just wondering why they're not in the Table of	03:22:13 19	Sarepta's projections generally for any of the final		
03:18:23 20	Contents.	03:22:15 20	products, the gene therapy products. And we were ordered to		
03:18:23 21	MS. FERNANDS: I do not know the answer to that	03:22:18 21	produces the adopted and approved projections from the point		
03:18:26 <b>22</b>	question, but I hadn't noticed that. And you are correct.	03:22:10 21	of hypothetical negotiation to the present.		
03:18:38 23	THE COURT: Okay. Well, I guess we can hold	03:22:23 23	And Sarepta then did produce a number of		
03:18:41 24	that thought.	03:22:25 24	spreadsheets for both the assumptions underlying them and		
03:18:42 <b>25</b>	So, Ms. Morrison.	03:22:30 <b>25</b>	the spreadsheets for a period of three years with Sarepta's		
00.10.42	14	00.22.00	16		
03:18:44	MS. FERNANDS: I'm sorry. This is the executed	03:22:33 1	projections in them.		
03:18:46 <b>2</b>	version, Your Honor. I don't know why	03:22:35	THE COURT: Okay. And are those things, those		
03:18:47	THE COURT: Probably a lot of last-minute	03:22:37	projections, are those things that your damages expert used?		
03:18:50 4	changes.	03:22:41 4	MS. MORRISON: Yes.		
03:18:50 <b>5</b>	All right. So, you were directing me to 8.4; is	03:22:42 <b>5</b>	THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'd have to say,		
03:18:53	that right, or 8.41?	03:22:46 6	looking at 8.4.1A and B, I have difficulty thinking that		
03:18:55 7	MS. MORRISON: Yes, 8.4.1 is the first place I	03:22:57 7	those help any. They certainly don't have any numbers in		
03:18:59	would direct Your Honor. That Section 8.4 is entitled	03:23:01	them. So, that's tentatively what I think about that.		
03:19:06	"Demand Forecast Plans."	03:23:06	Why don't you try another one.		
03:19:06 10	THE COURT: Right. And then, because I'm	03:23:08 10	MS. MORRISON: Sure, Your Honor. So, the next		
03:19:09 11	working on the assumption that if it's not in yellow, I can	03:23:09 11	one, and I mentioned this earlier, is the Joint Global		
03:19:12 12	say it out loud, 8.4.1 is "Details."	03:23:13 12	Development Plan, which is the schedule to the agreement.		
03:19:15 13	MS. MORRISON: Correct, Your Honor.	03:23:15 13	It's Schedule 4.3.1. So, I expect that will be at the very		
03:19:16 14	THE COURT: And hold on. Let me just read it	03:23:21 14	back, Your Honor, but again, it's not attached to the		
03:19:20 15	for a minute.	03:23:22 15	version that		
03:19:46 16	So, are you expecting there to be numbers of	03:23:23 16	THE COURT: 4.3.1, "Joint Global Development		
03:19:49 17	some kind in these paragraphs?	03:23:26 17	Plan." I see it.		
03:19:50 18	MS. MORRISON: Your Honor, it's very difficult	03:23:27 18	MS. MORRISON: Yes, Your Honor.		
03:19:51 19	for me to tell because in the fully redacted version, it	03:23:28 19	THE COURT: Or, I mean, I see the schedule. Ah,		
03:19:54 <b>20</b>	simply has an asterisk. Your Honor can't see that from	03:24:37 <b>20</b>	okay. Development Global Development Plan.		
03:19:57 <b>21</b>	here. I apologize. I don't know why I'm holding it up.	03:26:16 21	Ms. Fernands, I'm looking at a page that has 20		
03:20:00 <b>22</b>	But it simply has an asterisk.	03:26:20 <b>22</b>	at the bottom in this, what I think is all part of this one		
03:20:02 <b>23</b>	So, again, this is one of those things that if	03:26:26 23	schedule, which there seems to have numbers.		
03:20:03 <b>24</b>	there were numbers there, it could potentially be very	03:26:37 24	Have you found what I'm talking about?		
03:20:07 <b>25</b>	relevant to Sarepta's expectation of what it and Roche would	03:26:39 <b>25</b>	MS. FERNANDS: Yes, I found what you're talking		

	<del>- Case 1:20-cv-01226-RGA - Docum<u>e</u>nt 179-</del>	<del>L File</del>	<del>d 06/15/23 Page 5 of 15 PageID #:</del>		
	17 89		19		
03:26:40	about.	03:30:06	ask you to produce Pages 20 to 22?		
03:26:40 2	THE COURT: Is that something that's been	03:30:11 2	MS. FERNANDS: I hope I'm not arguing against		
03:26:42	otherwise produced?	03:30:13	myself here, because I think it is all irrelevant, but yes,		
03:26:43	MS. FERNANDS: I think, to the extent that type	03:30:16 <b>4</b> 03:30:21 <b>5</b>	if you were to think that any of it is relevant, everything		
03:26:49 5	of information has come to fruition in reality, it is		up to Page 20 should not be included.		
03:26:53	reported in the 10Ks.		MS. MORRISON: And, Your Honor, I guess just to		
03:26:57	THE COURT: So, it does seem that there's	03:30:25	respond to that, we're operating from a place of lack of		
03:27:27	certainly costs and expenses on that in the next couple of	03:30:29	knowledge. So, what Sarepta believes is relevant may be		
03:27:34	pages that are probably, in some at least general sense,	03:30:32	different than what Regenxbio believes is relevant. And so,		
03:27:52 10	relevant to expected profits down the road; right?	03:30:37 10	we don't see the there's a Protective Order in this case.		
03:27:55 11	MS. FERNANDS: I think to the extent any of this	03:30:41 11	We would agree that no one but the lawyers at Fish &		
03:27:58 12	is relevant, it would be captured in the adopted and	03:30:45 12	Richardson and the lawyers for Penn would be able to see		
03:28:03 13	approved projections that were produced. I don't think this	03:30:48 13	this agreement. That would be it.		
03:28:10 14	instance this and sort of this cost information, I	03:30:49 14	So, there's not a commercial risk to Sarepta to		
03:28:14 15	think, does not contain the types of projections that I	03:30:52 15	letting us look at this and determine whether there's things		
03:28:18 16	understand Ms. Morrison to be expecting, which I think is	03:30:56 16	in there that our damages expert thinks are relevant. We		
03:28:22 17	sort of more of the sales and a sales-type projection which	03:30:59 17	can deal with the commercial risk, but there's little or no		
03:28:26 18	I don't think is at all in this document and that we have	03:31:03 18	risk to allowing us to see the agreement to Sarepta.		
03:28:29 19	produced, again, through the adopted and approved	03:31:08 19	THE COURT: Okay. So, what's your third choice?		
03:28:33 <b>20</b>	projections.	03:31:11 20	MS. MORRISON: So, let me see. The other one is		
03:28:34 <b>21</b>	THE COURT: Ms. Morrison.	03:31:26 <b>21</b>	also there's also another schedule that several sections		
03:28:34 <b>22</b>	MS. MORRISON: I think what we're looking for is	03:31:34 <b>22</b>	of the agreement refer to. It's Schedule 1.263. And it's		
03:28:37 23	any information that goes to Sarepta's sort of, for lack of	03:31:43 23	entitled		
03:28:42 <b>24</b>	a better word, state of mind at the time of the hypothetical	03:31:43 <b>24</b>	THE COURT: Okay. Right. I think it's I saw		
03:28:46 <b>25</b>	negotiation. I, obviously, haven't seen this document.	03:31:46 <b>25</b>	it while I was leafing through trying to find the one we		
	10		20		
	18		20		
03:28:49 1	It's completely missing from the public version.	03:31:49 <b>1</b>	were just looking at. That's another one where the schedule		
03:28:49 <b>1</b> 03:28:52 <b>2</b>		03:31:49 <b>1</b> 03:31:52 <b>2</b>			
	It's completely missing from the public version.	•	were just looking at. That's another one where the schedule		
03:28:52 2	It's completely missing from the public version.  But to the extent it has any sort of projection	03:31:52	were just looking at. That's another one where the schedule isn't actually on the list in the Table of Contents.		
03:28:52 <b>2</b> 03:28:55 <b>3</b>	It's completely missing from the public version.  But to the extent it has any sort of projection about costs, about volumes, about anything like that, I'm	03:31:52 <b>2</b> 03:31:54 <b>3</b>	were just looking at. That's another one where the schedule isn't actually on the list in the Table of Contents.  MS. MORRISON: It's not, Your Honor.		
03:28:52 <b>2</b> 03:28:55 <b>3</b> 03:29:03 <b>4</b>	It's completely missing from the public version.  But to the extent it has any sort of projection about costs, about volumes, about anything like that, I'm operating from a place of lack of knowledge because I	03:31:52 <b>2</b> 03:31:54 <b>3</b> 03:31:55 <b>4</b>	were just looking at. That's another one where the schedule isn't actually on the list in the Table of Contents.  MS. MORRISON: It's not, Your Honor.  THE COURT: But I've got it here. Let me just		
03:28:52 <b>2</b> 03:28:55 <b>3</b> 03:29:03 <b>4</b> 03:29:06 <b>5</b>	It's completely missing from the public version.  But to the extent it has any sort of projection about costs, about volumes, about anything like that, I'm operating from a place of lack of knowledge because I haven't seen the document. But that might be relevant to	03:31:52 <b>2</b> 03:31:54 <b>3</b> 03:31:55 <b>4</b> 03:31:58 <b>5</b>	were just looking at. That's another one where the schedule isn't actually on the list in the Table of Contents.  MS. MORRISON: It's not, Your Honor.  THE COURT: But I've got it here. Let me just see whether I've got the first page of it.		
03:28:52 <b>2</b> 03:28:55 <b>3</b> 03:29:03 <b>4</b> 03:29:06 <b>5</b> 03:29:11 <b>6</b>	It's completely missing from the public version.  But to the extent it has any sort of projection about costs, about volumes, about anything like that, I'm operating from a place of lack of knowledge because I haven't seen the document. But that might be relevant to our damages analysis because it would be relevant to what	03:31:52 <b>2</b> 03:31:54 <b>3</b> 03:31:55 <b>4</b> 03:31:58 <b>5</b> 03:32:01 <b>6</b>	were just looking at. That's another one where the schedule isn't actually on the list in the Table of Contents.  MS. MORRISON: It's not, Your Honor.  THE COURT: But I've got it here. Let me just see whether I've got the first page of it.  MS. MORRISON: And, Your Honor, the reason we		
03:28:52 <b>2</b> 03:28:55 <b>3</b> 03:29:03 <b>4</b> 03:29:06 <b>5</b> 03:29:11 <b>6</b> 03:29:14 <b>7</b>	It's completely missing from the public version.  But to the extent it has any sort of projection about costs, about volumes, about anything like that, I'm operating from a place of lack of knowledge because I haven't seen the document. But that might be relevant to our damages analysis because it would be relevant to what Sarepta would be willing to pay to get a license from	03:31:52	were just looking at. That's another one where the schedule isn't actually on the list in the Table of Contents.  MS. MORRISON: It's not, Your Honor.  THE COURT: But I've got it here. Let me just see whether I've got the first page of it.  MS. MORRISON: And, Your Honor, the reason we think it might be relevant is there's definitions throughout		
03:28:52 <b>2</b> 03:28:55 <b>3</b> 03:29:03 <b>4</b> 03:29:06 <b>5</b> 03:29:11 <b>6</b> 03:29:14 <b>7</b> 03:29:19 <b>8</b>	It's completely missing from the public version.  But to the extent it has any sort of projection about costs, about volumes, about anything like that, I'm operating from a place of lack of knowledge because I haven't seen the document. But that might be relevant to our damages analysis because it would be relevant to what Sarepta would be willing to pay to get a license from Regenxbio.	03:31:52	were just looking at. That's another one where the schedule isn't actually on the list in the Table of Contents.  MS. MORRISON: It's not, Your Honor.  THE COURT: But I've got it here. Let me just see whether I've got the first page of it.  MS. MORRISON: And, Your Honor, the reason we think it might be relevant is there's definitions throughout the agreement of commercial supply agreement, development		
03:28:52	It's completely missing from the public version.  But to the extent it has any sort of projection about costs, about volumes, about anything like that, I'm operating from a place of lack of knowledge because I haven't seen the document. But that might be relevant to our damages analysis because it would be relevant to what Sarepta would be willing to pay to get a license from Regenxbio.  And so, without being able to see the document,	03:31:52	were just looking at. That's another one where the schedule isn't actually on the list in the Table of Contents.  MS. MORRISON: It's not, Your Honor.  THE COURT: But I've got it here. Let me just see whether I've got the first page of it.  MS. MORRISON: And, Your Honor, the reason we think it might be relevant is there's definitions throughout the agreement of commercial supply agreement, development supply agreement and supply agreements that refer to this		
03:28:52	It's completely missing from the public version.  But to the extent it has any sort of projection about costs, about volumes, about anything like that, I'm operating from a place of lack of knowledge because I haven't seen the document. But that might be relevant to our damages analysis because it would be relevant to what Sarepta would be willing to pay to get a license from Regenxbio.  And so, without being able to see the document, I can't fully answer Your Honor's questions.	03:31:52	were just looking at. That's another one where the schedule isn't actually on the list in the Table of Contents.  MS. MORRISON: It's not, Your Honor.  THE COURT: But I've got it here. Let me just see whether I've got the first page of it.  MS. MORRISON: And, Your Honor, the reason we think it might be relevant is there's definitions throughout the agreement of commercial supply agreement, development supply agreement and supply agreements that refer to this schedule as containing corresponding quantity agreements.		
03:28:52	It's completely missing from the public version.  But to the extent it has any sort of projection about costs, about volumes, about anything like that, I'm operating from a place of lack of knowledge because I haven't seen the document. But that might be relevant to our damages analysis because it would be relevant to what Sarepta would be willing to pay to get a license from Regenxbio.  And so, without being able to see the document, I can't fully answer Your Honor's questions.  THE COURT: Okay. All right.	03:31:52	were just looking at. That's another one where the schedule isn't actually on the list in the Table of Contents.  MS. MORRISON: It's not, Your Honor.  THE COURT: But I've got it here. Let me just see whether I've got the first page of it.  MS. MORRISON: And, Your Honor, the reason we think it might be relevant is there's definitions throughout the agreement of commercial supply agreement, development supply agreement and supply agreements that refer to this schedule as containing corresponding quantity agreements.  THE COURT: Hold on just a minute.		
03:28:52 2 03:28:55 3 03:29:03 4 03:29:06 5 03:29:11 6 03:29:14 7 03:29:19 8 03:29:19 9 03:29:23 10 03:29:27 11 03:29:32 12	It's completely missing from the public version.  But to the extent it has any sort of projection about costs, about volumes, about anything like that, I'm operating from a place of lack of knowledge because I haven't seen the document. But that might be relevant to our damages analysis because it would be relevant to what Sarepta would be willing to pay to get a license from Regenxbio.  And so, without being able to see the document, I can't fully answer Your Honor's questions.  THE COURT: Okay. All right.  So, let's just hold that thought. Give me a	03:31:52	were just looking at. That's another one where the schedule isn't actually on the list in the Table of Contents.  MS. MORRISON: It's not, Your Honor.  THE COURT: But I've got it here. Let me just see whether I've got the first page of it.  MS. MORRISON: And, Your Honor, the reason we think it might be relevant is there's definitions throughout the agreement of commercial supply agreement, development supply agreement and supply agreements that refer to this schedule as containing corresponding quantity agreements.  THE COURT: Hold on just a minute.  MS. MORRISON: Excuse me. I misspoke.		
03:28:52	It's completely missing from the public version.  But to the extent it has any sort of projection about costs, about volumes, about anything like that, I'm operating from a place of lack of knowledge because I haven't seen the document. But that might be relevant to our damages analysis because it would be relevant to what Sarepta would be willing to pay to get a license from Regenxbio.  And so, without being able to see the document, I can't fully answer Your Honor's questions.  THE COURT: Okay. All right.  So, let's just hold that thought. Give me a third one.	03:31:52	were just looking at. That's another one where the schedule isn't actually on the list in the Table of Contents.  MS. MORRISON: It's not, Your Honor.  THE COURT: But I've got it here. Let me just see whether I've got the first page of it.  MS. MORRISON: And, Your Honor, the reason we think it might be relevant is there's definitions throughout the agreement of commercial supply agreement, development supply agreement and supply agreements that refer to this schedule as containing corresponding quantity agreements.  THE COURT: Hold on just a minute.  MS. MORRISON: Excuse me. I misspoke.  Corresponding quality agreements fulfilling the requirements		
03:28:52	It's completely missing from the public version.  But to the extent it has any sort of projection about costs, about volumes, about anything like that, I'm operating from a place of lack of knowledge because I haven't seen the document. But that might be relevant to our damages analysis because it would be relevant to what Sarepta would be willing to pay to get a license from Regenxbio.  And so, without being able to see the document, I can't fully answer Your Honor's questions.  THE COURT: Okay. All right. So, let's just hold that thought. Give me a third one.  MS. FERNANDS: Before we move on, may I speak to	03:31:52	were just looking at. That's another one where the schedule isn't actually on the list in the Table of Contents.  MS. MORRISON: It's not, Your Honor.  THE COURT: But I've got it here. Let me just see whether I've got the first page of it.  MS. MORRISON: And, Your Honor, the reason we think it might be relevant is there's definitions throughout the agreement of commercial supply agreement, development supply agreement and supply agreements that refer to this schedule as containing corresponding quantity agreements.  THE COURT: Hold on just a minute.  MS. MORRISON: Excuse me. I misspoke.  Corresponding quality agreements fulfilling the requirements and so on.		
03:28:52	It's completely missing from the public version.  But to the extent it has any sort of projection about costs, about volumes, about anything like that, I'm operating from a place of lack of knowledge because I haven't seen the document. But that might be relevant to our damages analysis because it would be relevant to what Sarepta would be willing to pay to get a license from Regenxbio.  And so, without being able to see the document, I can't fully answer Your Honor's questions.  THE COURT: Okay. All right. So, let's just hold that thought. Give me a third one.  MS. FERNANDS: Before we move on, may I speak to the rest of that, Your Honor, because I think	03:31:52	were just looking at. That's another one where the schedule isn't actually on the list in the Table of Contents.  MS. MORRISON: It's not, Your Honor.  THE COURT: But I've got it here. Let me just see whether I've got the first page of it.  MS. MORRISON: And, Your Honor, the reason we think it might be relevant is there's definitions throughout the agreement of commercial supply agreement, development supply agreement and supply agreements that refer to this schedule as containing corresponding quantity agreements.  THE COURT: Hold on just a minute.  MS. MORRISON: Excuse me. I misspoke.  Corresponding quality agreements fulfilling the requirements and so on.  THE COURT: Yeah, on the surface, I don't see		
03:28:52	It's completely missing from the public version.  But to the extent it has any sort of projection about costs, about volumes, about anything like that, I'm operating from a place of lack of knowledge because I haven't seen the document. But that might be relevant to our damages analysis because it would be relevant to what Sarepta would be willing to pay to get a license from Regenxbio.  And so, without being able to see the document, I can't fully answer Your Honor's questions.  THE COURT: Okay. All right. So, let's just hold that thought. Give me a third one.  MS. FERNANDS: Before we move on, may I speak to the rest of that, Your Honor, because I think THE COURT: Sure.	03:31:52	were just looking at. That's another one where the schedule isn't actually on the list in the Table of Contents.  MS. MORRISON: It's not, Your Honor.  THE COURT: But I've got it here. Let me just see whether I've got the first page of it.  MS. MORRISON: And, Your Honor, the reason we think it might be relevant is there's definitions throughout the agreement of commercial supply agreement, development supply agreement and supply agreements that refer to this schedule as containing corresponding quantity agreements.  THE COURT: Hold on just a minute.  MS. MORRISON: Excuse me. I misspoke.  Corresponding quality agreements fulfilling the requirements and so on.  THE COURT: Yeah, on the surface, I don't see much here.		
03:28:52 2 03:28:55 3 03:29:03 4 03:29:06 5 03:29:11 6 03:29:19 8 03:29:19 9 03:29:23 10 03:29:27 11 03:29:32 12 03:29:35 13 03:29:36 14 03:29:40 15 03:29:41 16 03:29:41 17	It's completely missing from the public version.  But to the extent it has any sort of projection about costs, about volumes, about anything like that, I'm operating from a place of lack of knowledge because I haven't seen the document. But that might be relevant to our damages analysis because it would be relevant to what Sarepta would be willing to pay to get a license from Regenxbio.  And so, without being able to see the document, I can't fully answer Your Honor's questions.  THE COURT: Okay. All right.  So, let's just hold that thought. Give me a third one.  MS. FERNANDS: Before we move on, may I speak to the rest of that, Your Honor, because I think  THE COURT: Sure.  MS. FERNANDS: even if you're looking at	03:31:52	were just looking at. That's another one where the schedule isn't actually on the list in the Table of Contents.  MS. MORRISON: It's not, Your Honor.  THE COURT: But I've got it here. Let me just see whether I've got the first page of it.  MS. MORRISON: And, Your Honor, the reason we think it might be relevant is there's definitions throughout the agreement of commercial supply agreement, development supply agreement and supply agreements that refer to this schedule as containing corresponding quantity agreements.  THE COURT: Hold on just a minute.  MS. MORRISON: Excuse me. I misspoke.  Corresponding quality agreements fulfilling the requirements and so on.  THE COURT: Yeah, on the surface, I don't see much here.  All right. So, why don't we do this. Why don't		
03:28:52	It's completely missing from the public version.  But to the extent it has any sort of projection about costs, about volumes, about anything like that, I'm operating from a place of lack of knowledge because I haven't seen the document. But that might be relevant to our damages analysis because it would be relevant to what Sarepta would be willing to pay to get a license from Regenxbio.  And so, without being able to see the document, I can't fully answer Your Honor's questions.  THE COURT: Okay. All right.  So, let's just hold that thought. Give me a third one.  MS. FERNANDS: Before we move on, may I speak to the rest of that, Your Honor, because I think  THE COURT: Sure.  MS. FERNANDS: even if you're looking at starting at Page 20, which I would argue they have	03:31:52	were just looking at. That's another one where the schedule isn't actually on the list in the Table of Contents.  MS. MORRISON: It's not, Your Honor.  THE COURT: But I've got it here. Let me just see whether I've got the first page of it.  MS. MORRISON: And, Your Honor, the reason we think it might be relevant is there's definitions throughout the agreement of commercial supply agreement, development supply agreement and supply agreements that refer to this schedule as containing corresponding quantity agreements.  THE COURT: Hold on just a minute.  MS. MORRISON: Excuse me. I misspoke.  Corresponding quality agreements fulfilling the requirements and so on.  THE COURT: Yeah, on the surface, I don't see much here.  All right. So, why don't we do this. Why don't we just take a short break, all right, and I'll be back.		
03:28:52 2 03:28:55 3 03:29:03 4 03:29:06 5 03:29:11 6 03:29:19 8 03:29:19 9 03:29:27 11 03:29:32 12 03:29:35 13 03:29:36 14 03:29:40 15 03:29:41 17 03:29:41 17 03:29:43 18 03:29:46 19	It's completely missing from the public version.  But to the extent it has any sort of projection about costs, about volumes, about anything like that, I'm operating from a place of lack of knowledge because I haven't seen the document. But that might be relevant to our damages analysis because it would be relevant to what Sarepta would be willing to pay to get a license from Regenxbio.  And so, without being able to see the document, I can't fully answer Your Honor's questions.  THE COURT: Okay. All right.  So, let's just hold that thought. Give me a third one.  MS. FERNANDS: Before we move on, may I speak to the rest of that, Your Honor, because I think  THE COURT: Sure.  MS. FERNANDS: even if you're looking at starting at Page 20, which I would argue they have information, to the extent relevant in other ways,	03:31:52	were just looking at. That's another one where the schedule isn't actually on the list in the Table of Contents.  MS. MORRISON: It's not, Your Honor.  THE COURT: But I've got it here. Let me just see whether I've got the first page of it.  MS. MORRISON: And, Your Honor, the reason we think it might be relevant is there's definitions throughout the agreement of commercial supply agreement, development supply agreement and supply agreements that refer to this schedule as containing corresponding quantity agreements.  THE COURT: Hold on just a minute.  MS. MORRISON: Excuse me. I misspoke.  Corresponding quality agreements fulfilling the requirements and so on.  THE COURT: Yeah, on the surface, I don't see much here.  All right. So, why don't we do this. Why don't we just take a short break, all right, and I'll be back.  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.		
03:28:52 2 03:28:55 3 03:29:03 4 03:29:06 5 03:29:14 7 03:29:19 8 03:29:19 9 03:29:23 10 03:29:27 11 03:29:32 12 03:29:36 14 03:29:40 15 03:29:41 16 03:29:41 17 03:29:41 17 03:29:43 18 03:29:46 19 03:29:48 20	But to the extent it has any sort of projection about costs, about volumes, about anything like that, I'm operating from a place of lack of knowledge because I haven't seen the document. But that might be relevant to our damages analysis because it would be relevant to what Sarepta would be willing to pay to get a license from Regenxbio.  And so, without being able to see the document, I can't fully answer Your Honor's questions.  THE COURT: Okay. All right.  So, let's just hold that thought. Give me a third one.  MS. FERNANDS: Before we move on, may I speak to the rest of that, Your Honor, because I think  THE COURT: Sure.  MS. FERNANDS: even if you're looking at starting at Page 20, which I would argue they have information, to the extent relevant in other ways, everything up to Page 20, I think even from a cursory	03:31:52	were just looking at. That's another one where the schedule isn't actually on the list in the Table of Contents.  MS. MORRISON: It's not, Your Honor.  THE COURT: But I've got it here. Let me just see whether I've got the first page of it.  MS. MORRISON: And, Your Honor, the reason we think it might be relevant is there's definitions throughout the agreement of commercial supply agreement, development supply agreement and supply agreements that refer to this schedule as containing corresponding quantity agreements.  THE COURT: Hold on just a minute.  MS. MORRISON: Excuse me. I misspoke.  Corresponding quality agreements fulfilling the requirements and so on.  THE COURT: Yeah, on the surface, I don't see much here.  All right. So, why don't we do this. Why don't we just take a short break, all right, and I'll be back.  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.  (Recess was taken.)		
03:28:52 2 03:28:55 3 03:29:03 4 03:29:06 5 03:29:14 7 03:29:19 8 03:29:19 9 03:29:23 10 03:29:27 11 03:29:32 12 03:29:35 13 03:29:40 15 03:29:41 16 03:29:41 17 03:29:41 17 03:29:43 18 03:29:46 19 03:29:46 20 03:29:50 21	But to the extent it has any sort of projection about costs, about volumes, about anything like that, I'm operating from a place of lack of knowledge because I haven't seen the document. But that might be relevant to our damages analysis because it would be relevant to what Sarepta would be willing to pay to get a license from Regenxbio.  And so, without being able to see the document, I can't fully answer Your Honor's questions.  THE COURT: Okay. All right.  So, let's just hold that thought. Give me a third one.  MS. FERNANDS: Before we move on, may I speak to the rest of that, Your Honor, because I think  THE COURT: Sure.  MS. FERNANDS: even if you're looking at starting at Page 20, which I would argue they have information, to the extent relevant in other ways, everything up to Page 20, I think even from a cursory review, you can see has nothing to do with financials. And	03:31:52	were just looking at. That's another one where the schedule isn't actually on the list in the Table of Contents.  MS. MORRISON: It's not, Your Honor.  THE COURT: But I've got it here. Let me just see whether I've got the first page of it.  MS. MORRISON: And, Your Honor, the reason we think it might be relevant is there's definitions throughout the agreement of commercial supply agreement, development supply agreement and supply agreements that refer to this schedule as containing corresponding quantity agreements.  THE COURT: Hold on just a minute.  MS. MORRISON: Excuse me. I misspoke.  Corresponding quality agreements fulfilling the requirements and so on.  THE COURT: Yeah, on the surface, I don't see much here.  All right. So, why don't we do this. Why don't we just take a short break, all right, and I'll be back.  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.  (Recess was taken.)  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.		
03:28:52 2 03:28:55 3 03:29:03 4 03:29:06 5 03:29:11 6 03:29:14 7 03:29:19 8 03:29:19 9 03:29:23 10 03:29:27 11 03:29:32 12 03:29:36 14 03:29:40 15 03:29:41 16 03:29:41 17 03:29:41 17 03:29:41 18 03:29:46 19 03:29:48 20 03:29:54 22	It's completely missing from the public version.  But to the extent it has any sort of projection about costs, about volumes, about anything like that, I'm operating from a place of lack of knowledge because I haven't seen the document. But that might be relevant to our damages analysis because it would be relevant to what Sarepta would be willing to pay to get a license from Regenxbio.  And so, without being able to see the document, I can't fully answer Your Honor's questions.  THE COURT: Okay. All right.  So, let's just hold that thought. Give me a third one.  MS. FERNANDS: Before we move on, may I speak to the rest of that, Your Honor, because I think  THE COURT: Sure.  MS. FERNANDS: even if you're looking at starting at Page 20, which I would argue they have information, to the extent relevant in other ways, everything up to Page 20, I think even from a cursory review, you can see has nothing to do with financials. And I would so, clearly not relevant to what we're talking	03:31:52	were just looking at. That's another one where the schedule isn't actually on the list in the Table of Contents.  MS. MORRISON: It's not, Your Honor.  THE COURT: But I've got it here. Let me just see whether I've got the first page of it.  MS. MORRISON: And, Your Honor, the reason we think it might be relevant is there's definitions throughout the agreement of commercial supply agreement, development supply agreement and supply agreements that refer to this schedule as containing corresponding quantity agreements.  THE COURT: Hold on just a minute.  MS. MORRISON: Excuse me. I misspoke.  Corresponding quality agreements fulfilling the requirements and so on.  THE COURT: Yeah, on the surface, I don't see much here.  All right. So, why don't we do this. Why don't we just take a short break, all right, and I'll be back.  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.  (Recess was taken.)  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.  THE COURT: All right. Be seated.		
03:28:52 2 03:28:55 3 03:29:03 4 03:29:06 5 03:29:11 6 03:29:19 8 03:29:19 9 03:29:23 10 03:29:23 12 03:29:35 13 03:29:36 14 03:29:40 15 03:29:41 16 03:29:41 17 03:29:43 18 03:29:46 19 03:29:48 20 03:29:50 21 03:29:59 23	It's completely missing from the public version.  But to the extent it has any sort of projection about costs, about volumes, about anything like that, I'm operating from a place of lack of knowledge because I haven't seen the document. But that might be relevant to our damages analysis because it would be relevant to what Sarepta would be willing to pay to get a license from Regenxbio.  And so, without being able to see the document, I can't fully answer Your Honor's questions.  THE COURT: Okay. All right.  So, let's just hold that thought. Give me a third one.  MS. FERNANDS: Before we move on, may I speak to the rest of that, Your Honor, because I think  THE COURT: Sure.  MS. FERNANDS: even if you're looking at starting at Page 20, which I would argue they have information, to the extent relevant in other ways, everything up to Page 20, I think even from a cursory review, you can see has nothing to do with financials. And I would so, clearly not relevant to what we're talking about here for purposes of damages.	03:31:52	were just looking at. That's another one where the schedule isn't actually on the list in the Table of Contents.  MS. MORRISON: It's not, Your Honor.  THE COURT: But I've got it here. Let me just see whether I've got the first page of it.  MS. MORRISON: And, Your Honor, the reason we think it might be relevant is there's definitions throughout the agreement of commercial supply agreement, development supply agreement and supply agreements that refer to this schedule as containing corresponding quantity agreements.  THE COURT: Hold on just a minute.  MS. MORRISON: Excuse me. I misspoke.  Corresponding quality agreements fulfilling the requirements and so on.  THE COURT: Yeah, on the surface, I don't see much here.  All right. So, why don't we do this. Why don't we just take a short break, all right, and I'll be back.  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.  (Recess was taken.)  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.  THE COURT: All right. Be seated.  So, part of what's public in here seemed to me		

Filed 06/15/23 Page 6 of 15 PageID # 8998 1 1 03:45:59 their opening report. Can you give me some hint as what 03:48:57 MS. MORRISON: Perhaps Ms. Fernands can correct 2 they were using as public information? What sort of things 03:48:58 2 me if I've gotten the science wrong there, but that does not 03:46:12 were they using in the unredacted portions? 3 03:46:15 3 03:49:02 have anything to do with the cultured host cells in this 4 4 MS. MORRISON: So, I think I can give you a case. 03:46:18 5 5 general idea of what he was using. In general, he was using And I believe the same is true for the 03:49:05 03:46:24 6 03:46:29 6 the portions of -- the unredacted portions that he could see 03:49:07 gene-editing piece. Neither of those are related to the to describe what Sarepta's position would have been at the 7 cultured host cells. 03:49:12 03:46:34 time of the hypothetical negotiation. 8 THE COURT: So, the things in the agreement that 03:46:39 8 03:49:13 9 So, in other words, they had just made this very 9 talk about, for lack of a better word, progress payments for 03:46:41 03:49:15 10 large deal with Roche. They would have been looking forward 03:49:34 10 various milestones, is your expert able to tell that one of 03:46:43 11 to certain payments and milestones based on the deal with 03:49:42 11 these is the SRP one as opposed to the other ones? 03:46:46 12 Roche. We don't have the full scope of that because I think 03:49:48 12 MS. MORRISON: So, I'm not a hundred percent 03:46:50 03:46:53 13 perhaps some of it is in the parts that are missing exactly 03:49:50 13 sure. I believe our understanding is that at least that 14 what was coming forward. 03:49:55 14 upfront payment was for -- related to the development of 03:46:56 03:46:58 15 03:50:00 15 SRP-9001 using the patented cultured host cells, but I But the expert's theory, at a high level -- and 16 please don't hold me to this, Your Honor, if I don't have it 03:50:05 16 believe we're missing some of the information. I believe. 03:47:02 17 exactly right. I am certainly not an economist. But that 03:50:08 17 And, again, Your Honor, I may not have this 03:47:06 03:47:10 18 Sarepta at the time of the hypothetical negotiation would 03:50:10 18 exactly right, but to be able to delineate that exactly 03:47:13 19 have effectively had two choices. 03:50:14 19 because some of that information is redacted, I believe. 03:47:16 20 03:50:18 20 They could have either taken a license and But, again, I can't see what's redacted. 03:47:18 21 continued with development because their product required 03:50:20 21 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 03:47:21 22 the patented cultured host cell -- in order to continue the 03:50:22 22 Is there anything more you want to say, 23 development, they needed the patented cultured host cells, 03:50:24 23 Ms. Fernands? 03:47:24 03:47:28 24 or they would have had to stop and wait for the patent to 03:50:24 24 MS. FERNANDS: I think to the extent the expert 03:47:31 **25** 03:50:27 25 expire. is relying on this, there is -- the upfronts, as you said, 22 1 And so, what would they have been thinking 1 were public. To the extent that any other payment gets made 03:47:32 03:50:30 2 2 about? And the Roche agreement formed part of that of what in the future, that would be reported. None have been. 03:50:33 03:47:33 3 3 they would have been thinking about in considering the cost And their expert has not relied on this as being 03:47:37 03:50:37 it would have been to stop that development. 4 comparable. So, I don't think the details of the specific, 03:50:42 03:47:39 5 03:47:41 THE COURT: So, there's a very large number that 03:50:45 5 whether it be a percentage or the milestone for a particular 6 appears to be unredacted as kind of like the upfront 6 event, would be relevant because this is not relied on as a 03:50:49 03:47:44 7 7 comparable license. It's relied on for Sarepta's state of payment; right? Is that part of --03:50:52 03:47:48 8 03:50:55 8 MS. MORRISON: That's part of what he relied on, mind which, again, I think that the projections that we 03:47:50 9 yes, Your Honor. 9 provided would provide that information without having to 03:50:58 03:47:52 03:51:01 10 03:47:52 10 THE COURT: And the agreement, is it the case, produce this agreement. 11 your understanding, your expert's understanding, that large 03:51:02 11 MS. MORRISON: We, obviously, don't agree, Your 03:48:03 12 number, when it's talking about gene splicing or exon, are 03:51:10 12 Honor, or we wouldn't be here asking for production of the 03:48:09 13 those things that grow out of, in your theory, you know, the 03:51:12 13 agreement. At least that there is a reasonable likelihood 14 use of your cultured cells or are they just completely --03:51:15 14 that there are things in there that are relevant to 03:48:21 03:48:24 15 MS. MORRISON: No. 03:51:18 15 Sarepta's state of mind that would inform the hypothetical THE COURT: -- things that Sarepta has free 03:51:23 16 negotiation. 03:48:24 03:48:30 17 03:51:23 17 license to, you know, make as much money as they can from THE COURT: Okay. And so, the big number, the 18 it? 03:51:50 18 upfront payment, which I believe is three-quarters of a 03:48:35 03:48:35 19 MS. MORRISON: If I understand it correctly, 03:51:54 19 billion dollars, maybe that's not big in the pharmaceutical 03:48:38 **20** Your Honor, the exon-skipping drug -- Sarepta has a marketed 03:51:57 20 world, but it seems big to me. Your belief is that that is 03:48:43 **21** product that does not use the cultured host cells and is not 03:52:06 21 basically for the access to the SRP materials; right? 03:52:14 22 03:48:47 22 implicated in this case that is used to treat Duchenne MS. MORRISON: Yes, the SRP-9001 made using the 03:48:54 23 Muscular Dystrophy that is -- it's called an exon-skipping 03:52:17 23 cultured host cells. 03:48:56 24 03:52:19 24 drua. THE COURT: And your expert, his calculations 03:48:56 25 THE COURT: Okay. 03:52:31 25 here, I suppose, are for a reasonable royalty?

<del>Page 7 of 15 PageID #</del> 99 1 1 03:52:35 MS. MORRISON: Yeah, it's for a lump sum payment 03:55:28 MS. MORRISON: Well, so it would be factored 2 that the parties would have agreed to, but yes, it's not a 2 into how much they pay. And, Your Honor, it's difficult for 03:52:37 03:55:30 3 03:52:40 3 lost profits analysis. It's a reasonable royalty analysis 03:55:32 me to -- again, I'm not an economist, but essentially our 4 under Georgia-Pacific. 4 expert's damages number or his model looks at: What is the 03:52:42 5 THE COURT: And does the amount of money that 5 value of that 35 months to Sarepta and what is the value of 03:55:42 03:52:43 6 that 35 months to Regenxbio? And how would they come into 03:52:45 6 changed hands in this agreement play into that reasonable 03:55:45 7 royalty analysis in a quantitative way? 7 this and bargain between them to divide that value 03:55:49 03:52:50 8 MS. MORRISON: It does, Your Honor, only in 8 03:52:55 03:55:53 effectively? 9 9 that -- not in the sense that our expert certainly is not And so, if there are more payments in this 03:52:57 03:55:54 10 saying, well, Sarepta is going to get paid "X" dollars by 03:55:57 10 agreement that Sarepta would receive during that 35 months, 03:53:02 11 Roche, and so they would have paid "Y" dollars. It's not 03:56:01 11 that would add to the value of the license to Regenxbio. 12 that direct. 03:56:06 12 And I'm sure that our damages expert could explain this far 03:53:08 03:53:09 13 But it's a -- and, again, I don't want to 03:56:10 13 better than I can, because I'm not an economist, and he'll 14 have graphs and models, to the extent that we get that far 03:53:13 misquote. I don't have his report memorized. But it goes 03:56:13 14 in this case. But it would factor into the value of the 03:53:17 15 to several things. 03:56:17 15 03:53:18 16 It goes to Sarepta's state of mind as to the 03:56:23 16 license to Sarepta. 03:56:45 17 03:53:21 17 value of the market as to what they would be leaving on the THE COURT: What is your expert's bottom line 03:53:24 18 table if they didn't take a license. And so, how much the 03:56:50 18 lump sum number at this point? 03:53:28 19 license was worth to them. 03:56:52 19 MS. MORRISON: I'm going to misquote it, Your 03:53:30 20 03:56:55 20 Honor, but it's approximately -- it's just a little over It goes to at least those sorts of issues, but 03:53:33 21 it's not a direct quote. 03:56:58 21 Because he valued that delay and something 03:53:35 22 03:57:06 22 THE COURT: Well, I guess what I'm wondering is again, I'm not going to get the number right, but the value 03:53:42 23 so, if there are, you know, progress payments -- you know, 03:57:08 23 of that delay to Sarepta that if they had to wait the 03:53:45 24 let's say, just hypothetically here, but somewhere in this 03:57:12 24 35 months, it would have been on the order of 03:53:52 **25** agreement it says, Okay, and there will be \$10 million every I'm forgetting, but it was 1 month, you know, for the next five years, or it says \$5 1 the loss Sarepta would have incurred if they had 03:54:00 03:57:19 2 million, or it says a hundred million dollars, how is that 2 had to wait, according to his models. 03:57:23 03:54:05 3 3 going to affect anything? I'm quite sure Sarepta will disagree with that 03:57:26 MS. MORRISON: So, I think what it would impact, 4 valuation. 03:57:28 03:54:10 5 5 Your Honor, is, again, I can only talk in hypotheticals 03:57:28 THE COURT: Yeah, I think that's a reasonable 03:54:12 6 because I can't see the agreement. But if there were, for 6 certainty. 03:54:16 03:57:30 7 example, a provision that said there's going to be a 7 MS. MORRISON: Yeah. 03:57:30 03:54:19 8 8 03:57:58 progress payment of \$10 million for every month so long as THE COURT: So, does your economist write at 03:54:22 9 you, Sarepta, are actually making progress towards 9 this point, have sort of like a range of values based on, I 03:58:00 03:54:27 03:54:30 10 03:58:11 10 don't know, how much they were expecting to get paid over developing SRP-9001, without a license, excuse me, to the 11 patented cultured host cell, our damages theory is Sarepta 03:58:13 11 the 35 months? I mean, do you have any information at all 03:54:35 12 would have had to stop development and wait for the patent 03:58:18 12 about -- other than the upfront lump sum, is there any other 03:54:39 13 to expire, which is a term of about 35 months. 03:58:22 13 public information as to what's in the agreement, or do you 03:54:42 03:54:45 14 And so, Sarepta would be thinking, Well, if we 03:58:26 14 have any other information about how much revenue this was 03:54:48 15 don't take this license, we're going to lose 35 months of 03:58:31 15 supposed to generate? 16 \$10 million a month, and that's really valuable to us. And 03:58:32 16 MS. MORRISON: Yes, from Sarepta's projections, 03:54:51 03:58:34 17 03:54:55 17 so, it would go into how Sarepta is valuing that license -we do 03:54:59 18 THE COURT: Right. 03:58:35 18 THE COURT: Uh-huh. 03:54:59 19 MS. MORRISON: -- if there were such a 03:58:40 19 MS. MORRISON: But I have no way of knowing 20 provision. 03:58:42 20 whether those projections include -- those projections are 03:55:01 03:55:01 **21** 03:58:46 21 THE COURT: But, you know, once you've said Sarepta's -- at least my understanding of them is they are 03:55:06 22 \$750 million, you know, whether it's over the next 35 months 03:58:48 22 Sarepta's own U.S. sales. I don't know that they include --03:55:12 23 another \$750 million or whether it's, you know, a mere \$100 03:58:54 23 at least my understanding of them is that they do not 03:55:17 24 million, or if that's not being factored into how much they 03:58:57 24 include these kind of -- payments from Roche. 03:55:26 **25** pay, what difference does it make? 03:59:01 25 And so, that would be additional value that

	Case 1:20-cv-01226-RGA Document 179-	<del>2 File</del>	<del>d 06/15/23 Page 8 of 15 PageID #:</del>
		00	31
03:59:04	Sarepta potential if there is, as Your Honor	04:01:49	Mr. Estepan's deposition.
03:59:07	hypothesized, a provision that would require Sarepta to make	04:01:52	THE COURT: All right. As much fun as this is
03:59:12	progress in order to earn additional payments, that is not	04:01:54	for the two of you, Ms. Fernands, Page 69, there's
03:59:15 4	currently accounted for in our damages model, because we are	04:02:00 4	Table 9.4.1 that's called "Lead Product Regulatory
03:59:18 5	unaware of such payments. And that is not the Sarepta	04:02:04 5	Milestones." That's in the public version.
03:59:22 6	forecasts are based on their own U.S. sales.	04:02:09 6	Is the lead product here SRP-9001?
03:59:24 7	THE COURT: Do you have any comment on that,	04:02:13 7	MS. FERNANDS: Yes, Your Honor.
03:59:31	Ms. Fernands?	04:02:13	THE COURT: And the public version says,
03:59:32	MS. FERNANDS: I believe the forecasts I	04:02:20	"Achievement of lead product regulatory milestone event,"
03:59:35 10	don't know if that's entirely accurate, and I believe that	04:02:23 10	and then there's some redacted information. And part of the
03:59:38 11	the forecasts have tabs for a variety of issues, including a	04:02:29 11	redacted information doesn't provide based on various events
03:59:46 12	Roche tab, although I cannot speak to the details of what is	04:02:38 12	or what seem like decently large numbers of payments.
03:59:49 13	in that tab. But I do know that that tab is in the	04:02:48 13	Why isn't that relevant information?
03:59:51 14	projections that were produced.	04:02:51 14	MS. FERNANDS: I think, again, that isn't
03:59:52 15	I don't think I think what I'm hearing is a	04:02:53 15	relevant information because let's just step back. This is
03:59:55 16	lot of the agreement might, which is a lot of speculation	04:02:56 16	about the final products, ex-US, and not about cultured host
03:59:59 17	where what we have is it is definitely not asserted that	04:03:03 17	cells.
04:00:04 18	it's comparable, and they know the general overall value	04:03:03 18	And so, just to start on the broadest brush
04:00:08 19	from public information. So, the details are not relevant.	04:03:08 19	strokes, this agreement should not be relevant to damages.
04:00:16 <b>20</b>	MS. MORRISON: And, again, Your Honor, we just	04:03:11 <b>20</b>	To the extent it's relevant to damages as the larger picture
04:00:17 21	disagree, and I think Rule 26, right, does not require that	04:03:16 <b>21</b>	that their only argument is that it's Sarepta's state of
04:00:22 <b>22</b>	the information that we're seeking during discovery ends up	04:03:20 <b>22</b>	mind about continuing development and what that value is for
04:00:26 23	being admissible as evidence or that we necessarily have to	04:03:23 23	which Sarepta's projections should be adequate.
04:00:30 <b>24</b>	rely on it. And the reason I'm saying might is because, of	04:03:28 <b>24</b>	These details about what would be paid for ex-US
04:00:33 <b>25</b>	course, I haven't seen these provisions because Sarepta has	04:03:32 <b>25</b>	activities for the final products are far removed from the
	30		32
04:00:36 1	refused to produce them.	04:03:36 <b>1</b>	32 value of the cultured host cell that they assert that
04:00:36 <b>1</b> 04:00:39 <b>2</b>		04:03:41 2	
	refused to produce them.	_	value of the cultured host cell that they assert that Sarepta would be infringing.  MS. MORRISON: And I'm happy to address that if
04:00:39 2	refused to produce them.  And so, Sarepta, at this point, appears to be	04:03:41 <b>2</b> 04:04:01 <b>3</b> 04:04:03 <b>4</b>	value of the cultured host cell that they assert that Sarepta would be infringing.
04:00:39 <b>2</b> 04:00:43 <b>3</b> 04:00:46 <b>4</b> 04:00:50 <b>5</b>	refused to produce them.  And so, Sarepta, at this point, appears to be attempting to hold us to a standard of we have to show that the things that we haven't seen are going to be admissible or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can	04:03:41 <b>2</b> 04:04:01 <b>3</b> 04:04:03 <b>4</b> 04:04:03 <b>5</b>	value of the cultured host cell that they assert that Sarepta would be infringing.  MS. MORRISON: And I'm happy to address that if you  THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts
04:00:39 <b>2</b> 04:00:43 <b>3</b> 04:00:46 <b>4</b>	refused to produce them.  And so, Sarepta, at this point, appears to be attempting to hold us to a standard of we have to show that the things that we haven't seen are going to be admissible	04:03:41 <b>2</b> 04:04:01 <b>3</b> 04:04:03 <b>4</b> 04:04:03 <b>5</b> 04:04:12 <b>6</b>	value of the cultured host cell that they assert that Sarepta would be infringing.  MS. MORRISON: And I'm happy to address that if you
04:00:39 <b>2</b> 04:00:43 <b>3</b> 04:00:46 <b>4</b> 04:00:50 <b>5</b> 04:00:56 <b>7</b>	refused to produce them.  And so, Sarepta, at this point, appears to be attempting to hold us to a standard of we have to show that the things that we haven't seen are going to be admissible or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple	04:03:41 <b>2</b> 04:04:01 <b>3</b> 04:04:03 <b>4</b> 04:04:03 <b>5</b> 04:04:12 <b>6</b> 04:04:20 <b>7</b>	value of the cultured host cell that they assert that  Sarepta would be infringing.  MS. MORRISON: And I'm happy to address that if  you  THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?
04:00:39 <b>2</b> 04:00:43 <b>3</b> 04:00:46 <b>4</b> 04:00:50 <b>5</b> 04:00:53 <b>6</b> 04:00:56 <b>7</b> 04:01:00 <b>8</b>	refused to produce them.  And so, Sarepta, at this point, appears to be attempting to hold us to a standard of we have to show that the things that we haven't seen are going to be admissible or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our	04:03:41 <b>2</b> 04:04:01 <b>3</b> 04:04:03 <b>4</b> 04:04:03 <b>5</b> 04:04:12 <b>6</b> 04:04:20 <b>7</b> 04:04:29 <b>8</b>	value of the cultured host cell that they assert that Sarepta would be infringing.  MS. MORRISON: And I'm happy to address that if you  THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think
04:00:39 <b>2</b> 04:00:43 <b>3</b> 04:00:46 <b>4</b> 04:00:50 <b>5</b> 04:00:53 <b>6</b> 04:00:56 <b>7</b> 04:01:00 <b>8</b> 04:01:04 <b>9</b>	refused to produce them.  And so, Sarepta, at this point, appears to be attempting to hold us to a standard of we have to show that the things that we haven't seen are going to be admissible or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert	04:03:41 <b>2</b> 04:04:01 <b>3</b> 04:04:03 <b>4</b> 04:04:03 <b>5</b> 04:04:12 <b>6</b> 04:04:20 <b>7</b> 04:04:29 <b>8</b> 04:04:32 <b>9</b>	value of the cultured host cell that they assert that Sarepta would be infringing.  MS. MORRISON: And I'm happy to address that if you  THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think that's right.
04:00:39 2 04:00:43 3 04:00:46 4 04:00:50 5 04:00:53 6 04:00:56 7 04:01:00 8 04:01:04 9 04:01:07 10	refused to produce them.  And so, Sarepta, at this point, appears to be attempting to hold us to a standard of we have to show that the things that we haven't seen are going to be admissible or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.	04:03:41 2 04:04:01 3 04:04:03 4 04:04:03 5 04:04:12 6 04:04:20 7 04:04:29 8 04:04:32 9 04:04:33 10	value of the cultured host cell that they assert that Sarepta would be infringing.  MS. MORRISON: And I'm happy to address that if you  THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's
04:00:39	refused to produce them.  And so, Sarepta, at this point, appears to be attempting to hold us to a standard of we have to show that the things that we haven't seen are going to be admissible or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.  We clearly think that it's relevant to the	04:03:41 2 04:04:01 3 04:04:03 4 04:04:03 5 04:04:12 6 04:04:20 7 04:04:29 8 04:04:32 9 04:04:33 10 04:04:35 11	value of the cultured host cell that they assert that  Sarepta would be infringing.  MS. MORRISON: And I'm happy to address that if  you  THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's defined. I believe that might be relevant because the
04:00:39 2 04:00:43 3 04:00:46 4 04:00:50 5 04:00:56 7 04:01:00 8 04:01:04 9 04:01:07 10 04:01:08 11 04:01:11 12	refused to produce them.  And so, Sarepta, at this point, appears to be attempting to hold us to a standard of we have to show that the things that we haven't seen are going to be admissible or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.  We clearly think that it's relevant to the damages at least to the damages issues, and I really	04:03:41 2 04:04:01 3 04:04:03 4 04:04:03 5 04:04:12 6 04:04:20 7 04:04:29 8 04:04:32 9 04:04:33 10 04:04:35 11 04:04:39 12	value of the cultured host cell that they assert that  Sarepta would be infringing.  MS. MORRISON: And I'm happy to address that if  you  THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts  here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy  product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think  that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's  defined. I believe that might be relevant because the  accused cultured host cells are used to make more than
04:00:39	refused to produce them.  And so, Sarepta, at this point, appears to be attempting to hold us to a standard of we have to show that the things that we haven't seen are going to be admissible or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.  We clearly think that it's relevant to the damages at least to the damages issues, and I really haven't touched on the safe harbor issues. But it's	04:03:41 2 04:04:01 3 04:04:03 4 04:04:03 5 04:04:12 6 04:04:20 7 04:04:29 8 04:04:32 9 04:04:33 10 04:04:35 11 04:04:39 12 04:04:45 13	value of the cultured host cell that they assert that  Sarepta would be infringing.  MS. MORRISON: And I'm happy to address that if  you  THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts  here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy  product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think  that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's  defined. I believe that might be relevant because the  accused cultured host cells are used to make more than  SRP-9001. They are used to make other gene therapy products
04:00:39 2 04:00:43 3 04:00:46 4 04:00:50 5 04:00:53 6 04:00:56 7 04:01:00 8 04:01:04 9 04:01:07 10 04:01:08 11 04:01:11 12 04:01:13 13 04:01:17 14	refused to produce them.  And so, Sarepta, at this point, appears to be attempting to hold us to a standard of we have to show that the things that we haven't seen are going to be admissible or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.  We clearly think that it's relevant to the damages at least to the damages issues, and I really haven't touched on the safe harbor issues. But it's certainly relevant to the damages issues.	04:03:41 2 04:04:01 3 04:04:03 4 04:04:03 5 04:04:12 6 04:04:20 7 04:04:29 8 04:04:32 9 04:04:33 10 04:04:35 11 04:04:39 12 04:04:45 13 04:04:48 14	value of the cultured host cell that they assert that  Sarepta would be infringing.  MS. MORRISON: And I'm happy to address that if  you  THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts  here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy  product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think  that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's  defined. I believe that might be relevant because the  accused cultured host cells are used to make more than  SRP-9001. They are used to make other gene therapy products  by Sarepta. And so, perhaps those would also be relevant.
04:00:39 2 04:00:43 3 04:00:46 4 04:00:50 5 04:00:56 7 04:01:00 8 04:01:04 9 04:01:07 10 04:01:08 11 04:01:11 12 04:01:13 13 04:01:17 14 04:01:19 15	refused to produce them.  And so, Sarepta, at this point, appears to be attempting to hold us to a standard of we have to show that the things that we haven't seen are going to be admissible or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.  We clearly think that it's relevant to the damages at least to the damages issues, and I really haven't touched on the safe harbor issues. But it's certainly relevant to the damages issues.  MS. FERNANDS: I don't believe that either of	04:03:41 2 04:04:01 3 04:04:03 4 04:04:03 5 04:04:12 6 04:04:20 7 04:04:29 8 04:04:32 9 04:04:33 10 04:04:35 11 04:04:35 11 04:04:45 13 04:04:48 14 04:04:54 15	value of the cultured host cell that they assert that  Sarepta would be infringing.  MS. MORRISON: And I'm happy to address that if  you  THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts  here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy  product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think  that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's  defined. I believe that might be relevant because the  accused cultured host cells are used to make more than  SRP-9001. They are used to make other gene therapy products  by Sarepta. And so, perhaps those would also be relevant.  But I would agree with you on gene editing and
04:00:39 2 04:00:43 3 04:00:46 4 04:00:50 5 04:00:53 6 04:00:56 7 04:01:00 8 04:01:04 9 04:01:07 10 04:01:01 12 04:01:11 12 04:01:17 14 04:01:19 15 04:01:20 16	refused to produce them.  And so, Sarepta, at this point, appears to be attempting to hold us to a standard of we have to show that the things that we haven't seen are going to be admissible or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.  We clearly think that it's relevant to the damages at least to the damages issues, and I really haven't touched on the safe harbor issues. But it's certainly relevant to the damages issues.  MS. FERNANDS: I don't believe that either of the interrogatory responses or the damages report asserts	04:03:41 2 04:04:03 4 04:04:03 5 04:04:12 6 04:04:20 7 04:04:29 8 04:04:32 9 04:04:33 10 04:04:35 11 04:04:39 12 04:04:48 14 04:04:54 15 04:04:58 16	value of the cultured host cell that they assert that  Sarepta would be infringing.  MS. MORRISON: And I'm happy to address that if  you  THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts  here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy  product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think  that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's  defined. I believe that might be relevant because the  accused cultured host cells are used to make more than  SRP-9001. They are used to make other gene therapy products  by Sarepta. And so, perhaps those would also be relevant.  But I would agree with you on gene editing and  exon skipping, those are not relevant.
04:00:39 2 04:00:43 3 04:00:46 4 04:00:50 5 04:00:56 7 04:01:00 8 04:01:04 9 04:01:07 10 04:01:08 11 04:01:11 12 04:01:13 13 04:01:17 14 04:01:19 15 04:01:20 16 04:01:23 17	refused to produce them.  And so, Sarepta, at this point, appears to be attempting to hold us to a standard of we have to show that the things that we haven't seen are going to be admissible or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.  We clearly think that it's relevant to the damages at least to the damages issues, and I really haven't touched on the safe harbor issues. But it's certainly relevant to the damages issues.  MS. FERNANDS: I don't believe that either of the interrogatory responses or the damages report asserts this as a comparable license.	04:03:41 2 04:04:01 3 04:04:03 4 04:04:03 5 04:04:12 6 04:04:20 7 04:04:29 8 04:04:32 9 04:04:33 10 04:04:35 11 04:04:35 11 04:04:45 13 04:04:54 15 04:04:58 16 04:05:00 17	value of the cultured host cell that they assert that  Sarepta would be infringing.  MS. MORRISON: And I'm happy to address that if  you  THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts  here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy  product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think  that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's  defined. I believe that might be relevant because the  accused cultured host cells are used to make more than  SRP-9001. They are used to make other gene therapy products  by Sarepta. And so, perhaps those would also be relevant.  But I would agree with you on gene editing and  exon skipping, those are not relevant.  THE COURT: All right. Okay.
04:00:39 2 04:00:43 3 04:00:46 4 04:00:50 5 04:00:56 7 04:01:00 8 04:01:07 10 04:01:07 10 04:01:11 12 04:01:13 13 04:01:17 14 04:01:19 15 04:01:23 17 04:01:24 18	refused to produce them.  And so, Sarepta, at this point, appears to be attempting to hold us to a standard of we have to show that the things that we haven't seen are going to be admissible or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.  We clearly think that it's relevant to the damages at least to the damages issues, and I really haven't touched on the safe harbor issues. But it's certainly relevant to the damages issues.  MS. FERNANDS: I don't believe that either of the interrogatory responses or the damages report asserts this as a comparable license.  MS. MORRISON: Interrogatory 17, which asks for	04:03:41 2 04:04:01 3 04:04:03 4 04:04:03 5 04:04:12 6 04:04:20 7 04:04:29 8 04:04:32 9 04:04:33 10 04:04:35 11 04:04:39 12 04:04:48 14 04:04:58 16 04:05:00 17 04:05:03 18	value of the cultured host cell that they assert that  Sarepta would be infringing.  MS. MORRISON: And I'm happy to address that if  you  THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts  here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy  product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think  that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's  defined. I believe that might be relevant because the  accused cultured host cells are used to make more than  SRP-9001. They are used to make other gene therapy products  by Sarepta. And so, perhaps those would also be relevant.  But I would agree with you on gene editing and  exon skipping, those are not relevant.  THE COURT: All right. Okay.  Well, so here's what I'm going to do. With the
04:00:39 2 04:00:43 3 04:00:46 4 04:00:50 5 04:00:53 6 04:00:56 7 04:01:00 8 04:01:04 9 04:01:07 10 04:01:08 11 04:01:11 12 04:01:13 13 04:01:17 14 04:01:20 16 04:01:23 17 04:01:24 18 04:01:28 19	refused to produce them.  And so, Sarepta, at this point, appears to be attempting to hold us to a standard of we have to show that the things that we haven't seen are going to be admissible or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.  We clearly think that it's relevant to the damages at least to the damages issues, and I really haven't touched on the safe harbor issues. But it's certainly relevant to the damages issues.  MS. FERNANDS: I don't believe that either of the interrogatory responses or the damages report asserts this as a comparable license.  MS. MORRISON: Interrogatory 17, which asks for comparable licenses, this response was or, excuse me, this	04:03:41 2 04:04:01 3 04:04:03 4 04:04:03 5 04:04:12 6 04:04:20 7 04:04:29 8 04:04:32 9 04:04:33 10 04:04:35 11 04:04:35 11 04:04:45 13 04:04:54 15 04:04:58 16 04:05:00 17 04:05:03 18	value of the cultured host cell that they assert that  Sarepta would be infringing.  MS. MORRISON: And I'm happy to address that if  you  THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts  here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy  product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think  that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's  defined. I believe that might be relevant because the  accused cultured host cells are used to make more than  SRP-9001. They are used to make other gene therapy products  by Sarepta. And so, perhaps those would also be relevant.  But I would agree with you on gene editing and  exon skipping, those are not relevant.  THE COURT: All right. Okay.  Well, so here's what I'm going to do. With the  understanding that this agreement is Attorneys' Eyes Only,
04:00:39 2 04:00:43 3 04:00:46 4 04:00:50 5 04:00:56 7 04:01:00 8 04:01:04 9 04:01:07 10 04:01:08 11 04:01:11 12 04:01:17 14 04:01:19 15 04:01:20 16 04:01:24 18 04:01:28 19 04:01:33 20	refused to produce them.  And so, Sarepta, at this point, appears to be attempting to hold us to a standard of we have to show that the things that we haven't seen are going to be admissible or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.  We clearly think that it's relevant to the damages at least to the damages issues, and I really haven't touched on the safe harbor issues. But it's certainly relevant to the damages issues.  MS. FERNANDS: I don't believe that either of the interrogatory responses or the damages report asserts this as a comparable license.  MS. MORRISON: Interrogatory 17, which asks for comparable licenses, this response was or, excuse me, this document was cited in Interrogatory Number 17.	04:03:41 2 04:04:01 3 04:04:03 4 04:04:03 5 04:04:12 6 04:04:20 7 04:04:29 8 04:04:32 9 04:04:33 10 04:04:35 11 04:04:35 11 04:04:48 14 04:04:54 15 04:04:58 16 04:05:00 17 04:05:03 18 04:05:16 20	value of the cultured host cell that they assert that  Sarepta would be infringing.  MS. MORRISON: And I'm happy to address that if  you  THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts  here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy  product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think  that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's  defined. I believe that might be relevant because the  accused cultured host cells are used to make more than  SRP-9001. They are used to make other gene therapy products  by Sarepta. And so, perhaps those would also be relevant.  But I would agree with you on gene editing and  exon skipping, those are not relevant.  THE COURT: All right. Okay.  Well, so here's what I'm going to do. With the  understanding that this agreement is Attorneys' Eyes Only,  which I take it must include the expert, I'm going to order
04:00:39 2 04:00:43 3 04:00:46 4 04:00:50 5 04:00:56 7 04:01:00 8 04:01:07 10 04:01:01 12 04:01:11 12 04:01:12 13 04:01:21 15 04:01:22 16 04:01:23 17 04:01:24 18 04:01:33 20 04:01:37 21	refused to produce them.  And so, Sarepta, at this point, appears to be attempting to hold us to a standard of we have to show that the things that we haven't seen are going to be admissible or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.  We clearly think that it's relevant to the damages at least to the damages issues, and I really haven't touched on the safe harbor issues. But it's certainly relevant to the damages issues.  MS. FERNANDS: I don't believe that either of the interrogatory responses or the damages report asserts this as a comparable license.  MS. MORRISON: Interrogatory 17, which asks for comparable licenses, this response was or, excuse me, this document was cited in Interrogatory Number 17.  Now, again	04:03:41 2 04:04:01 3 04:04:03 4 04:04:03 5 04:04:12 6 04:04:29 8 04:04:29 8 04:04:33 10 04:04:35 11 04:04:39 12 04:04:48 14 04:04:54 15 04:04:58 16 04:05:00 17 04:05:01 19 04:05:16 20 04:05:26 21	value of the cultured host cell that they assert that  Sarepta would be infringing.  MS. MORRISON: And I'm happy to address that if  you  THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts  here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy  product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think  that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's  defined. I believe that might be relevant because the  accused cultured host cells are used to make more than  SRP-9001. They are used to make other gene therapy products  by Sarepta. And so, perhaps those would also be relevant.  But I would agree with you on gene editing and  exon skipping, those are not relevant.  THE COURT: All right. Okay.  Well, so here's what I'm going to do. With the  understanding that this agreement is Attorneys' Eyes Only,  which I take it must include the expert, I'm going to order  its production. I do so because I think, based on what I've
04:00:39 2 04:00:43 3 04:00:46 4 04:00:50 5 04:00:56 7 04:01:00 8 04:01:04 9 04:01:07 10 04:01:08 11 04:01:11 12 04:01:13 13 04:01:19 15 04:01:20 16 04:01:23 17 04:01:24 18 04:01:28 19 04:01:37 21 04:01:37 22	refused to produce them.  And so, Sarepta, at this point, appears to be attempting to hold us to a standard of we have to show that the things that we haven't seen are going to be admissible or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.  We clearly think that it's relevant to the damages at least to the damages issues, and I really haven't touched on the safe harbor issues. But it's certainly relevant to the damages issues.  MS. FERNANDS: I don't believe that either of the interrogatory responses or the damages report asserts this as a comparable license.  MS. MORRISON: Interrogatory 17, which asks for comparable licenses, this response was or, excuse me, this document was cited in Interrogatory Number 17.  Now, again  MS. FERNANDS: Well, what is the Bates number	04:03:41 2 04:04:01 3 04:04:03 4 04:04:03 5 04:04:12 6 04:04:20 7 04:04:29 8 04:04:32 9 04:04:33 10 04:04:35 11 04:04:35 11 04:04:45 13 04:04:54 15 04:04:58 16 04:05:00 17 04:05:01 18 04:05:12 19 04:05:26 21 04:05:35 22	value of the cultured host cell that they assert that  Sarepta would be infringing.  MS. MORRISON: And I'm happy to address that if  you  THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts  here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy  product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think  that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's  defined. I believe that might be relevant because the  accused cultured host cells are used to make more than  SRP-9001. They are used to make other gene therapy products  by Sarepta. And so, perhaps those would also be relevant.  But I would agree with you on gene editing and  exon skipping, those are not relevant.  THE COURT: All right. Okay.  Well, so here's what I'm going to do. With the  understanding that this agreement is Attorneys' Eyes Only,  which I take it must include the expert, I'm going to order  its production. I do so because I think, based on what I've  heard, that the lead product regulatory information that's
04:00:39 2 04:00:43 3 04:00:46 4 04:00:50 5 04:00:56 7 04:01:00 8 04:01:04 9 04:01:07 10 04:01:08 11 04:01:11 12 04:01:13 13 04:01:17 14 04:01:20 16 04:01:23 17 04:01:24 18 04:01:28 19 04:01:37 21 04:01:37 22 04:01:39 23	refused to produce them.  And so, Sarepta, at this point, appears to be attempting to hold us to a standard of we have to show that the things that we haven't seen are going to be admissible or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.  We clearly think that it's relevant to the damages at least to the damages issues, and I really haven't touched on the safe harbor issues. But it's certainly relevant to the damages issues.  MS. FERNANDS: I don't believe that either of the interrogatory responses or the damages report asserts this as a comparable license.  MS. MORRISON: Interrogatory 17, which asks for comparable licenses, this response was or, excuse me, this document was cited in Interrogatory Number 17.  Now, again  MS. FERNANDS: Well, what is the Bates number that it was cited as?	04:03:41 2 04:04:01 3 04:04:03 4 04:04:03 5 04:04:12 6 04:04:29 8 04:04:29 8 04:04:32 9 04:04:33 10 04:04:35 11 04:04:35 11 04:04:48 14 04:04:54 15 04:05:00 17 04:05:03 18 04:05:12 19 04:05:16 20 04:05:26 21 04:05:35 22	value of the cultured host cell that they assert that  Sarepta would be infringing.  MS. MORRISON: And I'm happy to address that if  you  THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts  here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy  product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think  that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's  defined. I believe that might be relevant because the  accused cultured host cells are used to make more than  SRP-9001. They are used to make other gene therapy products  by Sarepta. And so, perhaps those would also be relevant.  But I would agree with you on gene editing and  exon skipping, those are not relevant.  THE COURT: All right. Okay.  Well, so here's what I'm going to do. With the  understanding that this agreement is Attorneys' Eyes Only,  which I take it must include the expert, I'm going to order  its production. I do so because I think, based on what I've  heard, that the lead product regulatory information that's  in here, to the extent that I see it on, for example,
04:00:39 2 04:00:43 3 04:00:46 4 04:00:50 5 04:00:56 7 04:01:00 8 04:01:04 9 04:01:07 10 04:01:08 11 04:01:11 12 04:01:13 13 04:01:17 14 04:01:19 15 04:01:20 16 04:01:23 17 04:01:24 18 04:01:28 19 04:01:37 21 04:01:37 22	refused to produce them.  And so, Sarepta, at this point, appears to be attempting to hold us to a standard of we have to show that the things that we haven't seen are going to be admissible or end up being relevant to the damages analysis. All I can say is, based on this agreement, which was marked at multiple depositions, it was, in fact, cited in multiple interrogatory responses on comparable licenses and on our damages analysis, and then it was cited in our expert reports.  We clearly think that it's relevant to the damages at least to the damages issues, and I really haven't touched on the safe harbor issues. But it's certainly relevant to the damages issues.  MS. FERNANDS: I don't believe that either of the interrogatory responses or the damages report asserts this as a comparable license.  MS. MORRISON: Interrogatory 17, which asks for comparable licenses, this response was or, excuse me, this document was cited in Interrogatory Number 17.  Now, again  MS. FERNANDS: Well, what is the Bates number	04:03:41 2 04:04:01 3 04:04:03 4 04:04:03 5 04:04:12 6 04:04:20 7 04:04:29 8 04:04:32 9 04:04:33 10 04:04:35 11 04:04:35 11 04:04:45 13 04:04:54 15 04:04:58 16 04:05:00 17 04:05:01 18 04:05:12 19 04:05:26 21 04:05:35 22	value of the cultured host cell that they assert that  Sarepta would be infringing.  MS. MORRISON: And I'm happy to address that if  you  THE COURT: No, no. So, I take it in the parts  here where it talks about payments relating to gene therapy  product or gene editing, you don't care about those; right?  MS. MORRISON: Well, gene editing, I think  that's right.  Gene therapy product, I don't know how that's  defined. I believe that might be relevant because the  accused cultured host cells are used to make more than  SRP-9001. They are used to make other gene therapy products  by Sarepta. And so, perhaps those would also be relevant.  But I would agree with you on gene editing and  exon skipping, those are not relevant.  THE COURT: All right. Okay.  Well, so here's what I'm going to do. With the  understanding that this agreement is Attorneys' Eyes Only,  which I take it must include the expert, I'm going to order  its production. I do so because I think, based on what I've  heard, that the lead product regulatory information that's

	Case 1:20-cv-01226-RGA Document 179-		d <del>06/15/23 Page 9 of 15 PageID #:</del>
04:06:16 1	you know, are not direct evidence of value of the cultured	01 04:10:29 <b>1</b>	what has been redacted. And so, basically the dollar
04:06:23	cells or the production method, you know, there's both	04:10:36 2	figures for these things that are not the lead product or
04:06:31	quantitative and qualitative.	04:10:44 3	the gene therapy product, yeah, you can do that, but
04:06:33 4	And it may be that some of this is similar or	04:10:49 4	otherwise, you ought to give over a clean agreement.
04:06:37 <b>5</b>	different, I don't know, to the actual to the projections	04:10:54 <b>5</b>	Okay?
04:06:46 6	that were made. Maybe the projections should be roughly the	04:10:54 6	MS. FERNANDS: May I ask, and I hope this won't
04:06:50 7	same because well, you would think they would be somewhat	04:10:56 7	be controversial, schedule 11.6.2 is a Roche internal
04:06:56	close.	04:11:01 8	document concerning Roche compliance policies. It's a
04:06:56	But I think that for an expert to be relying on	04:11:05	rather long document. It is I think there's I think
04:07:04 10	a license, even for state of mind, it's a big handicap not	04:11:10 10	it's listed in the 11.6.2 is listed in the public version
04:07:11 11	to have the entire agreement available to him so that he can	04:11:15 11	of schedules, I think. But, Your Honor, you can see in the
04:07:21 12	decide what there is in it that is relevant to his	04:11:18 12	version that you have that it is a document with a Roche
04:07:28 13	undertaking.	04:11:22 13	header.
04:07:29 14	And, you know, I think the lead it seems to	04:11:22 14	THE COURT: It's 100 percent redacted; right?
04:07:35 15	me at least reasonable to say that the lead product	04:11:25 15	MS. FERNANDS: It was 100 percent redacted.
04:07:38 16	information is relevant to his undertaking, which is partly	04:11:27 16	Only the title was in the public.
04:07:44 17	based on the fact that in the expert report, he's managed to	04:11:28 17	THE COURT: It seems
04:07:51 18	use the agreement as part of his support for his opinions.	04:11:34 18	MS. MORRISON: Without having seen it, it's
04:08:02 19	And so, having a high degree of confidence in	04:11:35 19	difficult for me to say, but I will accept Ms. Fernands'
04:08:09 <b>20</b>	the Confidentiality Order, and I think it should be	04:11:40 <b>20</b>	representation.
04:08:23 <b>21</b>	produced.	04:11:40 <b>21</b>	THE COURT: Well, I mean, just looking at it, I
04:08:25 <b>22</b>	MS. FERNANDS: May we produce in a redacted form	04:11:42 <b>22</b>	mean, it really is like a statement of corporate policy that
04:08:27 23	with the exon skipping and gene editing all removed?	04:11:45 23	has nothing to do with I think this has nothing to do
04:08:31 <b>24</b>	MS. MORRISON: Your Honor, we don't have any	04:11:51 24	with this contract in particular; right?
04:08:32 <b>25</b>	objection to that other than our concern that as long as	04:11:53 <b>25</b>	MS. FERNANDS: That is my understanding, and it
			, -
	34		36
04:08:36 1	34 that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about	04:11:55 <b>1</b>	
04:08:36 <b>1</b> 04:08:39 <b>2</b>		04:11:55 <b>1</b> 04:11:58 <b>2</b>	36
•	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about	•	36 certainly is not even my client's information. It's our
04:08:39 2	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as	04:11:58 <b>2</b> 04:12:00 <b>3</b> 04:12:02 <b>4</b>	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?
04:08:39 <b>2</b> 04:08:41 <b>3</b>	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as THE COURT: Okay.	04:11:58 <b>2</b> 04:12:00 <b>3</b> 04:12:02 <b>4</b> 04:12:08 <b>5</b>	and certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to
04:08:39 <b>2</b> 04:08:41 <b>3</b> 04:08:41 <b>4</b>	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as THE COURT: Okay. MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going	04:11:58 <b>2</b> 04:12:00 <b>3</b> 04:12:02 <b>4</b> 04:12:08 <b>5</b> 04:12:11 <b>6</b>	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions
04:08:39 <b>2</b> 04:08:41 <b>3</b> 04:08:41 <b>4</b> 04:08:43 <b>5</b>	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as THE COURT: Okay. MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete	04:11:58 <b>2</b> 04:12:00 <b>3</b> 04:12:02 <b>4</b> 04:12:08 <b>5</b> 04:12:11 <b>6</b> 04:12:15 <b>7</b>	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and
04:08:39 <b>2</b> 04:08:41 <b>3</b> 04:08:41 <b>4</b> 04:08:43 <b>5</b> 04:08:47 <b>6</b>	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not	04:11:58 <b>2</b> 04:12:00 <b>3</b> 04:12:02 <b>4</b> 04:12:08 <b>5</b> 04:12:11 <b>6</b> 04:12:15 <b>7</b> 04:12:20 <b>8</b>	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?
04:08:39 <b>2</b> 04:08:41 <b>3</b> 04:08:41 <b>4</b> 04:08:43 <b>5</b> 04:08:47 <b>6</b> 04:08:52 <b>7</b>	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but	04:11:58 <b>2</b> 04:12:00 <b>3</b> 04:12:02 <b>4</b> 04:12:08 <b>5</b> 04:12:11 <b>6</b> 04:12:15 <b>7</b> 04:12:20 <b>8</b> 04:12:23 <b>9</b>	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce
04:08:39	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it	04:11:58 <b>2</b> 04:12:00 <b>3</b> 04:12:02 <b>4</b> 04:12:08 <b>5</b> 04:12:11 <b>6</b> 04:12:15 <b>7</b> 04:12:20 <b>8</b> 04:12:23 <b>9</b> 04:12:26 <b>10</b>	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.
04:08:39	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules,	04:11:58 <b>2</b> 04:12:00 <b>3</b> 04:12:02 <b>4</b> 04:12:08 <b>5</b> 04:12:11 <b>6</b> 04:12:15 <b>7</b> 04:12:20 <b>8</b> 04:12:23 <b>9</b>	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce
04:08:39	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules, may I also ask with the schedules that we focused on that	04:11:58	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you. It's an
04:08:39	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules, may I also ask with the schedules that we focused on that were, as you saw, only three pages that are arguably	04:11:58	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you. It's an interesting problem you all have.
04:08:39	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules, may I also ask with the schedules that we focused on that were, as you saw, only three pages that are arguably financial in the schedule that they pointed to, and the rest	04:11:58	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you. It's an interesting problem you all have.  We'll be in recess.
04:08:39	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules, may I also ask with the schedules that we focused on that were, as you saw, only three pages that are arguably financial in the schedule that they pointed to, and the rest goes to what I'd say technical or clinical.	04:11:58	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you. It's an interesting problem you all have.  We'll be in recess.  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
04:08:39	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules, may I also ask with the schedules that we focused on that were, as you saw, only three pages that are arguably financial in the schedule that they pointed to, and the rest goes to what I'd say technical or clinical.  THE COURT: No, I think the technical and	04:11:58	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you. It's an interesting problem you all have.  We'll be in recess.  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.  THE COURT: The transcript will serve as my
04:08:39 2 04:08:41 3 04:08:41 4 04:08:43 5 04:08:47 6 04:08:52 7 04:08:54 8 04:08:56 9 04:09:00 10 04:09:01 12 04:09:11 12 04:09:11 12 04:09:12 15 04:09:29 16 04:09:38 17	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules, may I also ask with the schedules that we focused on that were, as you saw, only three pages that are arguably financial in the schedule that they pointed to, and the rest goes to what I'd say technical or clinical.  THE COURT: No, I think the technical and clinical, I would think isn't going to make too much	04:11:58	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you. It's an interesting problem you all have.  We'll be in recess.  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.  THE COURT: The transcript will serve as my Order.
04:08:39	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules, may I also ask with the schedules that we focused on that were, as you saw, only three pages that are arguably financial in the schedule that they pointed to, and the rest goes to what I'd say technical or clinical.  THE COURT: No, I think the technical and clinical, I would think isn't going to make too much difference to a damages expert because I'm assuming he's	04:11:58	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you. It's an interesting problem you all have.  We'll be in recess.  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.  THE COURT: The transcript will serve as my Order.  (Court was recessed at 4:12 p.m.)
04:08:39 2 04:08:41 3 04:08:41 4 04:08:43 5 04:08:47 6 04:08:52 7 04:08:54 8 04:08:56 9 04:09:00 10 04:09:09 11 04:09:11 12 04:09:16 13 04:09:22 15 04:09:29 16 04:09:38 17 04:09:41 18 04:09:41 18	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules, may I also ask with the schedules that we focused on that were, as you saw, only three pages that are arguably financial in the schedule that they pointed to, and the rest goes to what I'd say technical or clinical.  THE COURT: No, I think the technical and clinical, I would think isn't going to make too much difference to a damages expert because I'm assuming he's probably not a whole lot better qualified than me to make	04:11:58	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you. It's an interesting problem you all have.  We'll be in recess.  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.  THE COURT: The transcript will serve as my Order.  (Court was recessed at 4:12 p.m.)  I hereby certify the foregoing is a true and
04:08:39	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules, may I also ask with the schedules that we focused on that were, as you saw, only three pages that are arguably financial in the schedule that they pointed to, and the rest goes to what I'd say technical or clinical.  THE COURT: No, I think the technical and clinical, I would think isn't going to make too much difference to a damages expert because I'm assuming he's probably not a whole lot better qualified than me to make sense of it. But I think, you know, basically the redaction	04:11:58	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you. It's an interesting problem you all have.  We'll be in recess.  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.  THE COURT: The transcript will serve as my Order.  (Court was recessed at 4:12 p.m.)  I hereby certify the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript from my stenographic notes in the proceeding.  /s/ Heather M. Triozzi
04:08:39 2 04:08:41 3 04:08:41 4 04:08:43 5 04:08:47 6 04:08:52 7 04:08:54 8 04:08:56 9 04:09:00 10 04:09:01 12 04:09:16 13 04:09:19 14 04:09:22 15 04:09:29 16 04:09:38 17 04:09:41 18 04:09:46 19 04:09:49 20 04:10:05 21	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules, may I also ask with the schedules that we focused on that were, as you saw, only three pages that are arguably financial in the schedule that they pointed to, and the rest goes to what I'd say technical or clinical.  THE COURT: No, I think the technical and clinical, I would think isn't going to make too much difference to a damages expert because I'm assuming he's probably not a whole lot better qualified than me to make sense of it. But I think, you know, basically the redaction of the exon skipping and the gene splicing, everyone agrees	04:11:58	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you. It's an interesting problem you all have.  We'll be in recess.  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.  THE COURT: The transcript will serve as my Order.  (Court was recessed at 4:12 p.m.)  I hereby certify the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript from my stenographic notes in the proceeding.  /s/ Heather M. Triozzi Certified Merit and Real-Time Reporter
04:08:39	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules, may I also ask with the schedules that we focused on that were, as you saw, only three pages that are arguably financial in the schedule that they pointed to, and the rest goes to what I'd say technical or clinical.  THE COURT: No, I think the technical and clinical, I would think isn't going to make too much difference to a damages expert because I'm assuming he's probably not a whole lot better qualified than me to make sense of it. But I think, you know, basically the redaction of the exon skipping and the gene splicing, everyone agrees those dollars are just irrelevant. And we're not going to	04:11:58	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you. It's an interesting problem you all have.  We'll be in recess.  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.  THE COURT: The transcript will serve as my Order.  (Court was recessed at 4:12 p.m.)  I hereby certify the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript from my stenographic notes in the proceeding.  /s/ Heather M. Triozzi
04:08:39	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules, may I also ask with the schedules that we focused on that were, as you saw, only three pages that are arguably financial in the schedule that they pointed to, and the rest goes to what I'd say technical or clinical.  THE COURT: No, I think the technical and clinical, I would think isn't going to make too much difference to a damages expert because I'm assuming he's probably not a whole lot better qualified than me to make sense of it. But I think, you know, basically the redaction of the exon skipping and the gene splicing, everyone agrees those dollars are just irrelevant. And we're not going to have arguments later on about whether or not you redacted	04:11:58	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you. It's an interesting problem you all have.  We'll be in recess.  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.  THE COURT: The transcript will serve as my Order.  (Court was recessed at 4:12 p.m.)  I hereby certify the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript from my stenographic notes in the proceeding.  /s/ Heather M. Triozzi Certified Merit and Real-Time Reporter
04:08:39	that is all that's removed, I don't have a concern about that. And as long as  THE COURT: Okay.  MS. MORRISON: As long as our expert isn't going to be cross-examined with, You didn't have the complete agreement, that's my only concern, to be honest. We're not going to use those parts, but  THE COURT: All right. Well, it seems to me, then, that you should redact those parts, that is, essentially the pricing parts. The rest of it  MS. FERNANDS: With respect to the schedules, may I also ask with the schedules that we focused on that were, as you saw, only three pages that are arguably financial in the schedule that they pointed to, and the rest goes to what I'd say technical or clinical.  THE COURT: No, I think the technical and clinical, I would think isn't going to make too much difference to a damages expert because I'm assuming he's probably not a whole lot better qualified than me to make sense of it. But I think, you know, basically the redaction of the exon skipping and the gene splicing, everyone agrees those dollars are just irrelevant. And we're not going to	04:11:58	certainly is not even my client's information. It's our co-development partner's information.  THE COURT: All right. Well, I understand so, you can redact that. Okay?  All right. And I assume you'll be able to produce to do those two, the one little set of redactions for dollar figures and the Roche corporate policy and produce this, you know, like by the end of the week?  MS. FERNANDS: Yes, we should be able to produce it by the end of the week, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Okay. Well, thank you. It's an interesting problem you all have.  We'll be in recess.  DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.  THE COURT: The transcript will serve as my Order.  (Court was recessed at 4:12 p.m.)  I hereby certify the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript from my stenographic notes in the proceeding.  /s/ Heather M. Triozzi Certified Merit and Real-Time Reporter

\$	8	19:13, 19:18, 19:22,	В	certainly [7] - 11:9,
		20:8, 20:9, 22:2,		16:7, 17:8, 21:17,
<b>\$10</b> [3] - 25:25, 26:8,	<b>8.4</b> [3] - 13:16, 14:5,	22:10, 23:8, 24:10,	backup [1] - 4:10	25:9, 30:14, 36:1
26:16	14:8	24:13, 25:6, 25:25, 26:6, 27:10, 28:13,	bad [1] - 6:6	certainty [1] - 28:6
<b>\$100</b> [1] - 26:23 <b>\$750</b> [2] - 26:22, 26:23	<b>8.4.1</b> [3] - 12:24, 14:7, 14:12	29:16, 30:6, 31:19,	bargain [1] - 27:7 based [8] - 9:17,	Certified [1] - 36:21 certify [1] - 36:18
\$7 <b>30</b> [2] - 20.22, 20.23	<b>8.4.1A</b> [1] - 16:6	32:19, 33:11, 33:18,	21:11, 28:9, 29:6,	changed [1] - 25:6
	<b>8.41</b> [1] - 14:6	34:6, 35:4	30:6, 31:11, 32:21,	changes [1] - 14:4
1	<b>8.5</b> [1] - 13:18	agreements [4] -	33:17	check [1] - 15:4
,	<b>8.7</b> [1] - 13:19	10:20, 20:9, 20:10,	batch [5] - 3:19, 3:22,	choice [1] - 19:19
/ <b>s</b> [1] - 36:21	<b>8.8</b> [1] - 13:16	20:13	4:6, 4:7, 4:10	choices [1] - 21:19
	<b>8.86</b> [1] - 13:16	agrees [1] - 34:21	batches [2] - 4:3, 6:12	chunk [1] - 4:24
1	<b>844</b> [1] - 1:10	ahead [2] - 7:11, 12:10	Bates [1] - 30:22	cited [5] - 30:7, 30:9,
4.002 40.00		<b>al</b> [1] - 2:7	BEFORE [1] - 1:14	30:20, 30:23, 30:24
1.263 [1] - 19:22	9	allowing [1] - 19:18	belief [1] - 24:20	clean [2] - 11:20, 35:4
<b>100</b> [2] - 35:14, 35:15	0.4.4	amount [3] - 6:8, 25:5	believes [2] - 19:8,	clear [1] - 34:25
<b>10K</b> [2] - 9:1, 9:2 <b>10Ks</b> [1] - 17:6	9.4.1 [1] - 31:4	analysis [7] - 9:20,	19:9	clearly [2] - 18:22,
<b>11.6.2</b> [2] - 35:7, 35:10	Λ	18:6, 25:3, 25:7, 30:5, 30:9	best [2] - 4:17, 12:18	30:11
<b>17</b> [2] - 30:18, 30:20	Α	ANASTASIA [1] - 1:22	better [5] - 12:5,	CLERK [4] - 2:2,
[2] 55.15, 55.25	able [7] - 9:4, 18:9,	Andrews [1] - 2:3	17:24, 23:9, 27:13, 34:19	20:19, 20:21, 36:14 client [3] - 2:8, 4:8, 6:1
2	19:12, 23:10, 23:18,	ANDREWS [1] - 1:14	between [3] - 7:19,	client [3] - 2.8, 4.8, 6.1 client's [1] - 36:1
	36:5, 36:9	answer [5] - 7:2, 7:6,	27:7, 32:25	clinical [6] - 4:17,
<b>2</b> [1] - 1:11	accept [1] - 35:19	7:7, 13:21, 18:10	big [4] - 24:17, 24:19,	4:20, 5:6, 6:13,
<b>20</b> [5] - 16:21, 18:18,	access [1] - 24:21	apologize [1] - 14:21	24:20, 33:10	34:15, 34:17
18:20, 19:1, 19:5	according [1] - 28:2	APPEARANCES [1] -	billion [1] - 24:19	clinicals [2] - 5:8, 6:16
20-1226-RGA [1] - 1:5	account [3] - 5:19,	1:15		close [2] - 9:9, 33:8
2012 [1] - 4:4	5:20, 7:4	approval [2] - 4:18,	BLA [1] - 4:18	closest [1] - 3:19
2023 [1] - 1:11	accounted [2] - 6:8,	4:20	Boggs [1] - 1:9	<b>co</b> [1] - 36:2
<b>22</b> [1] - 19:1	29:4	approved [4] - 4:19,	bottom [2] - 16:22,	co-development [1] -
<b>26</b> [1] - 29:21	accurate [2] - 29:10, 36:19	15:21, 17:13, 17:19	27:17	36:2
3	accused [1] - 32:12	area [1] - 9:16	break [1] - 20:18	coming [3] - 9:11,
,	Achievement [1] -	arguably [1] - 34:13 argue [1] - 18:18	bring [2] - 2:23, 11:19	9:21, 21:14
<b>301</b> [2] - 5:11, 5:14	31:9	arguing [1] - 19:2	broadest [1] - 31:18	comment [1] - 29:7
<b>35</b> [8] - 26:13, 26:15,	activities [2] - 5:9,	argument [1] - 31:21	brought [1] - 11:22 brush [1] - 31:18	commercial [4] - 4:19,
26:22, 27:5, 27:6,	31:25	arguments [1] - 34:23	BY [3] - 1:16, 1:19,	19:14, 19:17, 20:8 <b>company</b> [1] - 6:1
27:10, 27:24, 28:11	actual [1] - 33:5	ARSHT [1] - 1:19	1:22	comparable [6] - 24:4,
<b>3:00</b> [1] - 1:12	add [1] - 27:11	Article [1] - 13:14	1.22	24:7, 29:18, 30:8,
	additional [2] - 28:25,	assert [1] - 32:1	С	30:17, 30:19
4	29:3	asserted [1] - 29:17		Complaint [1] - 13:11
<b>4.3.1</b> [2] - 16:13, 16:16	address [2] - 10:13,	asserts [1] - 30:16	C.A [1] - 1:5	complete [1] - 34:5
<b>4:12</b> [1] - 36:17	32:3	assistant [1] - 11:12	calculations [1] -	completely [2] - 18:1,
	adequate [1] - 31:23	assume [1] - 36:5	24:24	22:14
5	admissible [2] - 29:23, 30:4	assuming [1] - 34:18	Caleb [1] - 1:9	compliance [1] - 35:8
	29.23, 30.4 adopted [3] - 15:21,	assumption [1] -	cannot [1] - 29:12	concern [3] - 33:25,
<b>5</b> [1] - 26:1	17:12, 17:19	14:11	captured [1] - 17:12	34:1, 34:6
_	affect [1] - 26:3	assumptions [1] - 15:24	care [1] - 32:7 case [5] - 19:10,	concerning [1] - 35:8
6	afternoon [1] - 2:4	asterisk [2] - 14:20,	22:10, 22:22, 23:4,	Conference [1] - 1:12
60 m 31·3 22·24	ago [1] - 15:6	14:22	27:15	confidence [1] - 33:19 Confidentiality [1] -
<b>69</b> [2] - 31:3, 32:24	agree [4] - 10:21,	attached [3] - 8:25,	cell [3] - 21:22, 26:11,	33:20
7	19:11, 24:11, 32:15	9:2, 16:14	32:1	considering [1] - 22:3
<u>'</u>	agreed [1] - 25:2	attempting [1] - 30:3	cells [12] - 10:11,	contain [1] - 17:15
<b>70</b> [1] - 32:24	agreement [42] - 3:6,	Attorneys' [1] - 32:19	10:25, 21:23, 22:14,	containing [1] - 20:10
<b>72</b> [1] - 32:24	6:19, 7:8, 7:11, 7:19,	available [2] - 8:24,	22:21, 23:3, 23:7,	Contents [3] - 13:14,
<b>74</b> [1] - 32:24	7:22, 8:23, 9:6, 9:17,	33:11	23:15, 24:23, 31:17,	13:20, 20:2
	9 23, 10:6, 10:15	avoid [2] - 34:24,	32:12, 33:2	continue [1] - 21:22
	10:22, 10:23, 10:24, 11:6, 15:3, 16:12	34:25	certain [2] - 6:10,	continued [1] - 21:21
	11:6, 15:3, 16:12		21:11	

continuing [1] - 31:22 contract [1] - 35:24 controversial [1] -35:7 copy [1] - 13:6 corporate [2] - 35:22, correct [6] - 3:18, 12:3, 13:22, 14:13, 15:11, 23:1 correctly [1] - 22:19 corresponding [2] -20:10, 20:13 cost [2] - 17:14, 22:3 costs [2] - 17:8, 18:3 couple [2] - 6:7, 17:8 course [5] - 5:23, 8:3, 10:1, 10:4, 29:25 COURT [90] - 1:1, 2:4, 2:11, 2:13, 2:20, 2:22, 3:12, 4:13, 4:22, 5:17, 5:22, 5:25, 6:21, 7:10, 7:15, 8:6, 8:9, 8:14, 8:19, 8:25, 9:7, 10:3, 10:17, 11:1, 11:3, 11:10, 11:16, 11:18, 11:21, 11:25, 12:4, 12:10, 12:15, 12:18, 12:25, 13:3, 13:7, 13:13, 13:23, 14:3, 14:10, 14:14, 15:4, 15:15, 16:2, 16:5, 16:16, 16:19, 17:2, 17:7, 17:21, 18:11, 18:16, 18:24, 19:19, 19:24, 20:4, 20:11, 20:15, 20:22, 22:5, 22:10, 22:16, 22:25, 23:8, 23:21, 24:17, 24:24, 25:5, 25:22, 26:18, 26:21, 27:17, 28:5, 28:8, 28:18, 29:7, 31:2, 31:8, 32:5, 32:17, 34:3, 34:8, 34:16, 35:14, 35:17, 35:21, 36:3, 36:11, 36:15 court [1] - 7:18 Court [3] - 2:2, 36:17, 36:22 Courthouse [1] - 1:9 cross [1] - 34:5 cross-examined [1] -34:5 cultured [15] - 10:11, 10:25, 21:22, 21:23, 22:14, 22:21, 23:3, 23:7, 23:15, 24 23, 26:11, 31:16, 32:1,

32:12, 33:1 curious [1] - 13:13 cursory [1] - 18:20

damages [26] - 3:6,

#### D

8:5, 8:7, 8:14, 8:17, 8:20, 9:20, 9:21, 10:23, 16:3, 18:6, 18:23, 19:16, 26:11, 27:4, 27:12, 29:4, 30:5, 30:9, 30:12, 30:14, 30:16, 31:19, 31:20, 34:18 date [2] - 4:23, 8:4 deal [3] - 19:17, 21:10, 21:11 debate [1] - 3:24 decent [1] - 4:24 decently [1] - 31:12 decide [1] - 33:12 Defendant [5] - 1:8, 1:23, 2:23, 3:8, 3:14 defined [1] - 32:11 definitely [1] - 29:17 definitions [2] - 15:5, 20:7 degree [1] - 33:19 **DELAWARE** [1] - 1:2 Delaware [1] - 1:10 delay [2] - 27:21, 27:23 delineate [1] - 23:18 Demand [1] - 14:9 deposition [3] - 30:24, 30:25, 31:1 depositions [1] - 30:7 **DEPUTY** [4] - 2:2, 20:19, 20:21, 36:14 **DEREK** [1] - 1:19 describe [1] - 21:7 destroyed [1] - 6:7 details [4] - 24:4, 29:12, 29:19, 31:24 Details [1] - 14:12 determine [1] - 19:15 **developing** [1] - 26:10 development [14] -7:24, 9:15, 9:19, 10:5, 16:20, 20:8, 21:21, 21:23, 22:4, 23:14, 26:12, 31:22, 36:2 Development [3] -16:12, 16:16, 16:20 difference [2] - 26:25,

34:18

different [7] - 5:17,

7 7 10 10, 11:23

12:6, 19:9, 33:5 difficult [3] - 14:18, 27:2, 35:19 difficulty [1] - 16:6 direct [5] - 12:5, 14:8, 25:12, 25:21, 33:1 directed [1] - 13:18 directing [1] - 14:5 disagree [2] - 28:3, 29:21 disclose [1] - 7:3 disclosing [1] - 7:2 discovery [4] - 5:5, 6:12, 15:6, 29:22 **Discovery** [1] - 1:12 discussing [3] - 15:7, 15:9, 15:12 discussion [2] - 3:19, 3:21 Dispute [1] - 1:12 dispute [1] - 15:6 District [1] - 36:22 **DISTRICT** [2] - 1:1, 1:2 divide [1] - 27:7 document [8] - 17:18, 17:25, 18:5, 18:9, 30:20, 35:8, 35:9, 35:12 documentation [1] -5:25 dollar [2] - 35:1, 36:7 dollars [6] - 24:19, 25:10, 25:11, 26:2, 28:1, 34:22 done [1] - 3:16 down [1] - 17:10 drug [3] - 4:3, 22:20, 22:24 Duchenne [1] - 22:22 due [1] - 8:18 during [2] - 27:10, 29:22 Dystrophy [1] - 22:23

## Ε

earn [1] - 29:3 economist [4] - 21:17, 27:3, 27:13, 28:8 editing [6] - 10:16, 23:6, 32:7, 32:8, 32:15, 33:23 effect [1] - 6:3 effectively [2] - 21:19, 27:8 efficient [1] - 11:24 either [2] - 21:20, 30:15 emails [1] - 5:5 EMANUEL [1] - 1:21

entirely [1] - 29:10 entitled [2] - 14:8, 19:23 **ESQUIRE** [3] - 1:16, 1:19, 1:22 essentially [4] - 5:18, 7:4, 27:3, 34:10 Estepan's [1] - 31:1 et [1] - 2:7 Europe [1] - 5:1 **European** [1] - 5:9 event [3] - 15:17, 24:6, 31:9 events [1] - 31:11 evidence [2] - 29:23, ex [4] - 5:9, 5:11, 31:16, 31:24 ex-US [4] - 5:9, 5:11, 31:16, 31:24 exactly [5] - 9:25, 21:13, 21:17, 23:18 examined [1] - 34:5 example [2] - 26:7, 32:23 excellent [1] - 11:12 excuse [4] - 7:24, 20:12, 26:10, 30:19 executed [1] - 14:1 exhibit [2] - 30:25 Exhibit [1] - 13:10 exists [1] - 6:11 exon [8] - 10:7, 10:15, 22:12, 22:20, 22:23, 32:16, 33:23, 34:21 exon-skipping [2] -22:20, 22:23 expect [1] - 16:13 expectation [1] -14:25 expectations [1] - 8:4 expected [1] - 17:10 expecting [3] - 14:16, 17:16, 28:10 expenses [1] - 17:8 expert [21] - 8:18, 8:20, 9:22, 9:23, 10:12, 10:23, 16:3, 19:16, 20:25, 23:10, 23:24, 24:3, 24:24, 25:9, 27:12, 30:9, 32:20, 33:9, 33:17, 34:4, 34:18 expert's [4] - 21 15,

22:11, 27:4, 27:17

end [3] - 30:5, 36:8,

enrollment [1] - 5:11

ends [1] - 29:22

entire [1] - 33:11

36:10

expiration [5] - 4:4, 4:12, 4:14, 15:8, 15:14 expire [2] - 21:25, 26:13 expired [2] - 4:24, 4:25 explain [1] - 27:12 extensively [1] - 9:22 extent [10] - 5:8, 17:4, 17:11, 18:2, 18:19, 23:24, 24:1, 27:14, 31:20, 32:23 Eyes [1] - 32:19

#### F

fact [2] - 30:7, 33:17 factor [1] - 27:15 factored [2] - 26:24, 27:1 facts [1] - 9:16 Fahnestock [1] - 2:16 FAHNESTOCK [1] -1:19 far [4] - 5:6, 27:12, 27:14, 31:25 FDA [1] - 5:16 Fernands [13] - 2:19, 2:20, 4:14, 7:20, 13:2, 13:5, 13:13, 15:11, 16:21, 23:1, 23:23, 29:8, 31:3 FERNANDS [36] -1:22, 2:19, 2:21, 4:1, 4:16, 5:3, 5:20, 5:24, 6:10, 11:13, 11:17, 11:19, 11:22, 12:2, 13:10, 13:21, 14:1, 15:18, 16:25, 17:4, 17:11, 18:14, 18:17, 19:2, 23:24, 29:9, 30:15, 30:22, 31:7, 31:14, 33:22, 34:11, 35:6, 35:15, 35:25, 36:9 Fernands '[1] - 35:19 few [1] - 12:13 figures [2] - 35:2, 36:7 final [5] - 4:7, 15:19, 31:16, 31:25, 32:25 financial [1] - 34:14 financials [1] - 18:21 fine [1] - 7:15 first [2] - 14:7, 20:5 Fish [1] - 19:11 FISH [1] - 1:16 five [1] - 26:1 focused [1] - 34:12 FOR [1] - 1:2

Forecast [1] - 14:9 forecasts [4] - 15:13, 29:6, 29:9, 29:11 foregoing [1] - 36:18 forget [1] - 4:23 forgetting [1] - 27:25 form [1] - 33:22 formed [1] - 22:2 forward [2] - 21:10, 21:14

frankly [1] - 10:18 free [1] - 22:16 Friday [1] - 8:18 fruition [1] - 17:5 fulfilling [1] - 20:13 full [2] - 15:3, 21:12 fully [3] - 13:5, 14:19, 18:10 fun [1] - 31:2 future [1] - 24:2

#### G

gather [1] - 9:7 gene [15] - 10:16, 10:24, 15:13, 15:20, 22:12, 23:6, 32:6, 32:7, 32:8, 32:10, 32:13, 32:15, 33:23, 34:21, 35:3 gene-editing [1] - 23:6 general [4] - 17:9, 21:5, 29:18 generally [1] - 15:19 generate [1] - 28:15 Georgia [1] - 25:4 Georgia -Pacific [1] -25:4 germane [1] - 6:22 Global [3] - 16:11, 16:16, 16:20 global [5] - 5:15, 7:24, 9:15, 9:19, 10:5 graphs [1] - 27:14 grow [1] - 22:13 guess [4] - 12:5, 13:23, 19:6, 25:22 guys [1] - 7:10

# Н

handicap [1] - 33:10 hands [1] - 25:6 handwriting [1] - 2:18 happy [2] - 7:18, 32:3 harbor [4] - 3:6, 8:10, 8 11, 30:13 header [1] - 35:13 hear [2] - 7:15 7:17

heard [1] - 32:22 hearing [1] - 29:15 Heather [1] - 36:21 help [1] - 16:7 helpful [3] - 7:9, 7:14, 13:9

hereby [1] - 36:18 high [2] - 21:15, 33:19 highlighted [3] -11:14, 12:21 highly [1] - 9:10

hint [1] - 21:1 hold [7] - 13:3, 13:23, 14:14, 18:12, 20:11, 21:16, 30:3 holding [1] - 14:21

honest [1] - 34:6 Honor [40] - 3:11, 3:18, 7:7, 7:25, 8:17, 9:14, 11:2, 11:9, 11:13, 12:9, 12:13,

13:1, 14:2, 14:8, 14:13, 14:18, 14:20, 15:10, 16:10, 16:14, 16:18, 18:15, 19:6, 20:3, 20:6, 21:16, 22:9, 22:20, 23:17, 24:12, 25:8, 26:5, 27:2, 27:20, 29:1,

29:20, 31:7, 33:24, 35:11, 36:10 Honor's [1] - 18:10 HONORABLE [1] -

1:14 Honorable [1] - 2:3 hope [2] - 19:2, 35:6 host [12] - 10:25, 21:22, 21:23, 22:21, 23:3, 23:7, 23:15,

24:23, 26:11, 31:16, 32:1, 32:12 hundred [4] - 3:18,

6:22, 23:12, 26:2 hundred -percent [1] -

6.22

hypothesized [1] -29:2

hypothetical [9] - 8:5, 9:10, 9:12, 9:21, 15:22, 17:24, 21:8, 21:18, 24:15 hypothetically [1] -

hypotheticals [1] -26:5

25:24

ı

idea [1] - 21:5 impact [1] - 26:4 implicated [1] - 22:22 **important** [1] - 9:12 IN [1] - 1:1 INC [2] - 1:4, 1:7 include [4] - 28:20, 28:22, 28:24, 32:20 included [1] - 19:5 including [1] - 29:11 incurred [1] - 28:1 indicated [1] - 4:5 inform [2] - 9:20, 24:15 information [28] - 3:2, 3:8, 3:23, 5:7, 6:11, 6:17, 12:23, 17:5, 17:14, 17:23, 18:19, 21:2, 23:16, 23:19, 24:9, 28:11, 28:13, 28:14, 29:19, 29:22, 31:10, 31:11, 31:13, 31:15, 32:22, 33:16, 36:1, 36:2 informed [1] - 9:18 **infringing** [1] - 32:2 instance [1] - 17:14 interested [1] - 10:20 interesting [1] - 36:12 internal [1] - 35:7 interrogatory [3] -30:8, 30:16, 30:18 Interrogatory [1] -30:20

#### J

irrelevant [2] - 19:3,

issue [6] - 3:20, 7:25,

8:2, 8:3, 8:15, 8:17

25:20, 29:11, 30:12,

issues [6] - 15:2,

30:13, 30:14

items [1] - 9:18

34:22

Japan [1] - 5:1 Joint [2] - 16:11, 16:16 joint [1] - 7:23

#### Κ

keeps [1] - 6:1 kind [3] - 14:17, 22:6, 28:24 kinds [1] - 15:2 King [1] - 1:10 knowing [1] - 28:19 knowledge [3] - 4:17, 18:4, 19:8

## L

lack [4] - 17:23, 18:4, 19:7, 23:9 large [5] - 6:15, 21:10, 22:5, 22:11, 31:12 larger [1] - 31:20 last [1] - 14:3 last-minute [1] - 14:3 lawyers [2] - 19:11, 19:12 Lead [1] - 31:4 lead [6] - 31:6, 31:9, 32:22, 33:14, 33:15, 35:2 leafing [1] - 19:25 least [8] - 17:9, 23:13, 24:13, 25:20, 28:21, 28:23, 30:12, 33:15 leaving [1] - 25:17 letter [2] - 8:11, 10:4 letters [1] - 2:22 letting [1] - 19:15 level [1] - 21:15 license [14] - 9:13, 18:7, 21:20, 22:17, 24:7, 25:18, 25:19, 26:10, 26:15, 26:17, 27:11, 27:16, 30:17, 33:10 licenses [2] - 30:8, 30:19 likelihood [1] - 24:13 limited [1] - 5:5 line [1] - 27:17 list [1] - 20:2 listed [2] - 35:10 LLP [1] - 1:19 look [3] - 12:20, 13:17, 19:15 looking [8] - 13:14, 16:6, 16:21, 17:22, 18:17, 20:1, 21:10, 35:21 looks [1] - 27:4 lose [1] - 26:15 loss [1] - 28:1 lost [1] - 25:3

## М

lump [3] - 25:1, 27:18,

loud [1] - 14:12

28:12

magic [1] - 12:15 main [2] - 15:17, 15:18 managed [1] - 33:17 manufacturer [1] - 4:8 marked [1] - 30:6 market [1] - 25:17

marketed [1] - 22:20 materials [1] - 24:21 mean [6] - 5:22, 5:23, 16:19, 28:11, 35:21, 35:22 memorized [1] - 25:14 mentioned [1] - 16:11 mere [1] - 26:23 Merit [1] - 36:21 method [1] - 33:2 might [11] - 3:2, 5:4, 10:1, 11:17, 11:23, 13:1, 18:5, 20:7, 29:16, 29:24, 32:11 milestone [2] - 24:5, 31.9 Milestones [1] - 31:5 milestones [2] -21:11, 23:10 million [9] - 25:25, 26:2, 26:8, 26:16, 26:22, 26:23, 26:24, 27:21 mind [8] - 2:25, 9:11, 17:24, 24:8, 24:15, 25:16, 31:22, 33:10 minute [3] - 14:3, 14:15, 20:11 misquote [2] - 25:14, 27:19 misrepresent [1] -5:13 missing [6] - 3:21, 12:22, 12:23, 18:1, 21:13, 23:16 misspoke [1] - 20:12 model [2] - 27:4, 29:4 28:2

models [2] - 27:14, money [2] - 22:17, 25:5 month [4] - 9:8, 26:1, 26:8, 26:16 months [8] - 26:13, 26:15, 26:22, 27:5,

28:11 MORRIS [1] - 1:19 Morrison [11] - 2:8, 2:15, 3:1, 3:10, 4:5, 6:24, 12:4, 13:25, 17:16, 17:21, 20:25 MORRISON [65] -

27:6, 27:10, 27:24,

1:16, 2:10, 2:12, 3:11, 3:17, 7:6, 7:13, 7:17, 8:8, 8:13, 8:16, 8:20, 9:2, 9:9, 10:14, 10:18, 11:2, 11:9, 12:8, 12:11, 12:17, 12:20, 13:1, 13:4,

13:8, 13:12, 14:7, 14:13, 14:18, 15:10, 15:16, 16:4, 16:10, 16:18, 17:22, 19:6, 19:20, 20:3, 20:6, 20:12, 21:4, 22:8, 22:15, 22:19, 23:1, 23:12, 24:11, 24:22, 25:1, 25:8, 26:4, 26:19, 27:1, 27:19, 28:7, 28:16, 28:19, 29:20, 30:18, 30:24, 32:3, 32:8, 33:24, 34:4, 35:18 Morrison 's [1] - 13:18 most [1] - 11:23 move [1] - 18:14 MS [99] - 2:10, 2:12, 2:19, 2:21, 3:11, 3:17, 4:1, 4:16, 5:3, 5:20, 5:24, 6:10, 7:6, 7:13, 7:17, 8:8, 8:13, 8:16, 8:20, 9:2, 9:9, 10:14, 10:18, 11:2, 11:9, 11:13, 11:17, 11:19, 11:22, 12:2, 12:8, 12:11, 12:17, 12:20, 13:1, 13:4, 13:8, 13:10, 13:12, 13:21, 14:1, 14:7, 14:13, 14:18, 15:10, 15:16, 15:18, 16:4, 16:10, 16:18, 16:25, 17:4, 17:11, 17:22, 18:14, 18:17, 19:2, 19:6, 19:20, 20:3, 20:6, 20:12, 21:4, 22:8, 22:15, 22:19, 23:1, 23:12, 23:24, 24:11, 24:22, 25:1, 25:8, 26:4, 26:19, 27:1, 27:19, 28:7, 28:16, 28:19, 29:9, 29:20, 30:15, 30:18, 30:22, 30:24, 31:7, 31:14, 32:3, 32:8, 33:22, 33:24, 34:4, 34:11, 35:6, 35:15, 35:18, 35:25, 36:9 multiple [2] - 30:7 Muscular [1] - 22:23 must [1] - 32:20

## Ν

name [1] - 2:9 necessarily [1] - 29:23 needed [2] - 15:12, 21:23 negotiation [9] - 8 5

9:10, 9:12, 9:21, 15:22, 17:25, 21:8, 21:18, 24:16 negotiator 's [1] - 9:11 next [4] - 16:10, 17:8, 26:1. 26:22 NICHOLS [1] - 1:19 none [2] - 5:1, 24:2 North [1] - 1:10 notes [2] - 3:4, 36:19 nothing [5] - 9:16, 10:10, 18:21, 35:23 nothing 's [1] - 5:14 notice [1] - 13:18 noticed [1] - 13:22 November [1] - 4:4 number [9] - 12:15, 15:23, 22:5, 22:12, 24:17, 27:4, 27:18, 27:22, 30:22 Number [1] - 30:20 numbers [6] - 12:9, 14:16, 14:24, 16:7, 16:23, 31:12

## 0

objection [1] - 33:25 obviously [2] - 17:25, 24:11 occurred [1] - 15:7 OF [1] - 1:2 offer [1] - 7:22 once [2] - 10:10, 26:21 one [23] - 9:16, 10:3, 10:7, 11:11, 11:12, 11:20, 12:7, 12:12, 12:22, 13:3, 13:8, 14:23, 16:9, 16:11, 16:22, 18:13, 19:11, 19:20, 19:25, 20:1, 23:10, 23:11, 36:6 ones [1] - 23:11 ongoing [1] - 4:20 opening [3] - 8:17, 8:21, 21:1 operating [2] - 18:4, 19:7 opinions [1] - 33:18 opposed [1] - 23:11 Order [3] - 19:10, 33:20, 36:16 order [4] - 21:22, 27:24, 29:3, 32:20 ordered [1] - 15:20 otherwise [3] - 4:21, 17:3, 35:4 ought [1] - 35:4 outside [1] - 5:2

overall [1] - 29:18

own [2] - 28:22, 29:6

#### Р

p.m [2] - 1:12, 36:17

page [2] - 16:21, 20:5

18:20, 19:5, 31:3,

Pacific [1] - 25:4

Page [8] - 18:18,

32:24

pages [2] - 17:9, 34:13 Pages [1] - 19:1 pagination [2] - 12:6, 12.7 paid [4] - 25:10, 25:11, 28:10, 31:24 paper [1] - 13:6 paragraphs [1] - 14:17 part [11] - 8:1, 8:2, 8:3, 8:22, 16:22, 20:23, 22:2, 22:7, 22:8, 31:10, 33:18 partially [2] - 12:12, 12:23 particular [3] - 10:6, 24:5, 35:24 particularly [1] - 10:22 parties [4] - 3:24, 7:20, 8:18, 25:2 parties' [1] - 8:4 partly [1] - 33:16 partner's [1] - 36:2 parts [7] - 10:19, 10:21, 21:13, 32:5, 34:7, 34:9, 34:10 past [1] - 8:18 patent [10] - 4:4, 4:12, 4:14, 4:24, 4:25, 10:11, 15:8, 15:14, 21:24, 26:12 patented [5] - 10:25, 21:22, 21:23, 23:15, 26:11 pausing [1] - 11:4 pay [3] - 18:7, 26:25, payment [6] - 22:7, 23:14, 24:1, 24:18, 25:1, 26:8 payments [10] - 21:11, 23:9, 25:23, 27:9, 28:24, 29:3, 29:5, 31:12, 32:6, 32:25 Penn [1] - 19:12 Pennsylvania [1] - 2:7 percent [5] - 3:18, 6:22, 23:12, 35:14, 35:15 percentage [1] - 24 5 perhaps [5] - 6:22,

8:16, 21:13, 23:1, 32:14 period [1] - 15:25 personally [1] - 5:23 pharmaceutical [1] -24:19 picture [1] - 31:20 piece [2] - 3:24, 23:6 place [4] - 5:2, 14:7, 18:4, 19:7 Plaintiff [2] - 1:5, 1:17 Plaintiff's [1] - 3:5 Plaintiffs [1] - 4:2 plan [3] - 7:24, 9:15, 9:19 Plan [3] - 16:12, 16:17, 16:20 Plans [1] - 14:9 play [1] - 25:6 podium [1] - 7:14 point [10] - 7:19, 7:21, 7:23, 8:16, 11:6, 15:21, 18:24, 27:18, 28:9, 30:2 pointed [1] - 34:14 policies [1] - 35:8 policy [2] - 35:22, 36:7 portions [5] - 10:15, 10:23, 21:3, 21:6 position [2] - 9:20, 21:7 potential [1] - 29:1 potentially [1] - 14:24 prefer [2] - 34:24, 34:25 present [1] - 15:22 presiding [1] - 2:3 presumably [2] - 2:17, 3:16 pretty [1] - 9:22 pricing [1] - 34:10 problem [1] - 36:12 proceeding [1] - 36:20 PROCEEDINGS [1] -2:1 produce [11] - 15:13, 15:21, 15:23, 18:25, 19:1, 24:10, 30:1, 33:22, 36:6, 36:8, 36.9 produced [10] - 4:2, 4:3, 4:7, 8:23, 9:3, 17:3, 17:13, 17:19, 29:14, 33:21 Product [1] - 31:4 product [17] - 4:3, 4:7,

5:10, 5:19, 7:1, 7:5,

15:14, 21:21, 22:21,

32:10, 32:22, 33:15,

31:6, 31:9, 32:7,

35:2, 35:3 production [5] - 6:15, 15:3, 24:12, 32:21, 33:2 products [6] - 15:20, 31:16, 31:25, 32:13, 32:25 profits [2] - 17:10, 25:3 progress [5] - 23:9, 25:23, 26:8, 26:9, 29:3 projection [2] - 17:17, 18.2 projections [15] -15:19, 15:21, 16:1, 16:3, 17:13, 17:15, 17:20, 24:8, 28:16, 28:20, 29:14, 31:23, 33:5, 33:6 pronounce [1] - 2:8 Protective [1] - 19:10 provide [5] - 4:9, 6:11, 6:12, 24:9, 31:11 provided [5] - 3:8. 3:14, 6:2, 6:13, 24:9 provision [3] - 26:7, 26:20, 29:2 provisions [1] - 29:25 public [12] - 12:2, 13:15, 18:1, 20:23, 21:2, 24:1, 28:13, 29:19, 31:5, 31:8, 35:10, 35:16 publicly [1] - 8:23 purposes [2] - 8:5, 18:23 put [1] - 6:17

#### Q

qualified [1] - 34:19 qualitative [1] - 33:3 quality [1] - 20:13 quantitative [2] - 25:7, 33:3 quantity [1] - 20:10 quarters [1] - 24:18 questions [2] - 8:9, 18:10 QUINN [1] - 1:21 quite [2] - 12:12, 28:3 quote [1] - 25:21

#### R

range [1] - 28:9 rather [1] - 35 9 read [2] - 2:22 14 14 real [4] - 7:19, 7:21,

Page 14 of 15 PageID #:

7:23, 34:25 Real [1] - 36:21 Real-Time [1] - 36:21 reality [1] - 17:5 really [4] - 8:9, 26:16, 30:12, 35:22 reason [2] - 20:6, 29:24 reasonable [6] -24:13, 24:25, 25:3, 25:6, 28:5, 33:15 receive [2] - 4:10, 27:10 recess [1] - 36:13 Recess [1] - 20:20 recessed [1] - 36:17 recited [1] - 30:25 records [5] - 3:19, 3:22, 4:6, 4:7, 4:10 redact [2] - 34:9, 36:4 redacted [20] - 2:24, 8:22, 9:22, 11:11, 11:15, 11:24, 12:1, 12:2, 12:23, 13:5, 14:19, 23:19, 23:20, 31:10, 31:11, 33:22, 34:23, 35:1, 35:14, 35:15 redaction [1] - 34:20 redactions [1] - 36:6 refer [2] - 19:22, 20:9 referring [1] - 10:14 refused [1] - 30:1 Regenxbio [7] - 2:10, 2:11, 2:12, 18:8, 19:9, 27:6, 27:11 REGENXBIO [1] - 1:4 Regenxbio 's [1] - 9:16 Regulatory [1] - 31:4 regulatory [3] - 5:9, 31:9, 32:22 relate [1] - 10:15 related [3] - 4:6, 23:6, 23:14 relates [1] - 7:8 relating [1] - 32:6 relationship [1] -32:25 released [1] - 4:8 relevance [1] - 7:8 relevant [32] - 3:6, 6:18, 9:10, 9:19, 10:22, 14:25, 17:10, 17:12, 18:5, 18:6, 18:19, 18:22, 19:4, 19:8, 19:9, 19:16, 20:7, 24:6, 24:14, 29:19, 30:5, 30 11, 30:14, 31:13, 31:15, 31:19, 31:20, 32:11,

32:14, 32:16, 33:12, 33:16 relied [7] - 8:22, 9:5, 10:23, 22:8, 24:3, 24:6, 24:7 rely [3] - 9:4, 9:22, 29:24 relying [2] - 23:25, remember [1] - 15:8 removed [3] - 31:25, 33:23, 34:1 reply [1] - 8:21 report [9] - 8:21, 9:23, 10:12, 21:1, 25:14, 30:16, 33:17 reported [2] - 17:6, 24:2 Reporter [1] - 36:21 reporter [1] - 7:18 reports [2] - 8:18, 30:10 representation [1] -35:20 represented [2] - 4:2, 4:9 requesting [1] - 15:2 require [2] - 29:2, 29.21 required [1] - 21:21 requirements [1] -20:13 respect [1] - 34:11 respond [1] - 19:7 response [2] - 3:7, 30:19 responses [2] - 30:8, 30:16 rest [3] - 18:15, 34:10, 34:14 revenue [1] - 28:14 review (1) - 18:21 RICHARD [1] - 1:14 Richard [1] - 2:3 Richardson [1] -19:12 RICHARDSON [1] -1:16 rise [4] - 2:2, 20:19, 20:21, 36:14 risk [3] - 19:14, 19:17, 19:18 road [1] - 17:10 Roche [14] - 8:23, 9:6, 9:23, 14:25, 21:10, 21:12, 22:2, 25:11, 28:24, 29:12, 35:7, 35:8, 35:12, 36 7 roughly [1] - 33 6

royalty [3] - 24:25

25:3, 25:7 Rule [1] - 29:21 run [1] - 5:6 running [1] - 5:15

#### S

serve [1] - 36:15 safe [4] - 3:6, 8:10, session [1] - 2:3 8:11, 30:13 set [1] - 36:6 sales [5] - 15:13, several [2] - 19:21, 17:17, 28:22, 29:6 25:15 sales-type [1] - 17:17 short [1] - 20:18 Sarepta [37] - 2:7, 5:7, show [1] - 30:3 5:11, 5:15, 5:16, side [1] - 6:25 9:11, 9:13, 10:4, signed [1] - 9:6 10:19, 15:12, 15:23, 18:7, 19:8, 19:14, similar [1] - 33:4 19:18, 21:18, 22:16, simply [2] - 14:20, 22:20, 25:10, 26:9, 14:22 26:11, 26:14, 26:17, 27:5, 27:10, 27:16, 4:25, 6:5, 6:6 27:23, 28:1, 28:3, 29:1, 29:2, 29:5, 29:25, 30:2, 32:2, 33:23, 34:21 32:14 **SAREPTA** [1] - 1:7 Sarepta's [14] - 9:20, somewhere [1] -14:25, 15:19, 15:25, 25:24 17:23, 21:7, 24:7, 24:15, 25:16, 28:16, 14:1 28:21, 28:22, 31:21, sort [9] - 3:1, 3:7, 31:23 saw [2] - 19:24, 34:13 schedule [8] - 16:12, 28:9 16:19, 16:23, 19:21, sorts [1] - 25:20 20:1, 20:10, 34:14, specific [2] - 10:24, 35:7 24:4 Schedule [2] - 16:13, speculation [1] -19:22 29:16 schedules [3] - 34:11, splicing [2] - 22:12, 34:12, 35:11 34:21 science [1] - 23:2 spreadsheet [6] - 4:3, scope [1] - 21:12 4:6, 4:11, 6:2, 6:13, seated [2] - 2:5, 20:22 6:15 second [4] - 3:13, spreadsheets [2] -6:15, 10:4, 13:3 15:24, 15:25 section [1] - 12:9 **SRP** [2] - 23:11, 24:21 Section [2] - 12:24, SRP-9001 [8] - 3:9, 14:8 3:15, 4:3, 23:15, sections [3] - 9:25, 24:22, 26:10, 31:6, 12:21, 19:21 32:13 see [20] - 2:15, 3:2, stand [1] - 3:12 7:13, 11:24, 14:20, standard [1] - 30:3 16:17, 16:19, 18:9, start [2] - 12:12, 31:18 18:21, 19:10, 19:12, started [3] - 8:11, 8:12 19:18, 19:20, 20:5, **starting** [1] - 18:18 20:15, 21:6, 23:20, state [7] - 9:11, 17:24, 26:6, 32:23, 35:11 24:7, 24:15, 25:16, seeking [1] - 29:22

segue [1] - 7:12 States [2] - 3:15, 5:2 sense [3] - 17:9, 25:9, STATES [1] - 1:1 34:20 stay [1] - 7:18 senses [1] - 12:11 stenographic [1] sent [5] - 5:1, 5:10, 36:19 5:14, 6:5, 6:16 step [1] - 31:15 sticking [3] - 7:19, 7:21, 7:23 still [4] - 3:18, 3:20, 3:23, 4:16 stop [3] - 21:24, 22:4, 26:12 Street [1] - 1:10 strokes [1] - 31:19 stuff [6] - 4:13, 4:15, significant [1] - 8:15 11:7, 11:25, 15:7, 15:8 submission [1] - 5:16 submitted [2] - 4:19, sitting [5] - 4:21, 4:22, 8:21 **SULLIVAN** [1] - 1:21 skipping [6] - 10:16, sum [3] - 25:1, 27:18, 28:12 22:20, 22:23, 32:16, **supply** [3] - 20:8, 20:9 slightly [2] - 5:17, 7:7 support [1] - 33:18 somewhat [1] - 33:7 suppose [1] - 24:25 supposed [1] - 28:15 surface [1] - 20:15 sorry [3] - 3:11, 11:2, SUSAN [1] - 1:16 suspect [1] - 9:17 suspicion [2] - 9:18, 6:25, 17:14, 17:17, 10:1 17:23, 18:2, 21:2, т

tab [3] - 29:12, 29:13 table [1] - 25:18 Table [4] - 13:14, 13:19, 20:2, 31:4 tabs [1] - 29:11 talks [1] - 32:6 team [2] - 3:20, 7:20 technical [2] - 34:15, 34:16 tentatively [1] - 16:8 term [1] - 26:13 terms [2] - 3:25, 5:25 THE [92] - 1:1, 1:2, 1:14, 2:4, 2:11, 2:13, 2:20, 2:22, 3:12, 4:13, 4:22, 5:17, 5:22, 5:25, 6:21, 7:10, 7:15, 8:6, 8:9, 8:14, 8:19, 8:25, 9:7, 10:3, 10:17, 11:1, 11:3, 11:10, 11:16, 11:18, 11:21, 11:25, 12:4, 12:10, 12:15, 12:18, 12:25, 13:3, 13:7, 13:13, 13:23,

seem [2] - 17:7, 31:12

31:21, 33:10

statement [1] - 35:22

14:3, 14:10, 14:14, 15:4, 15:15, 16:2, 16:5, 16:16, 16:19, 17:2, 17:7, 17:21, 18:11, 18:16, 18:24, 19:19, 19:24, 20:4, 20:11, 20:15, 20:22, 22:5, 22:10, 22:16, 22:25, 23:8, 23:21, 24:17, 24:24, 25:5, 25:22, 26:18, 26:21, 27:17, 28:5, 28:8, 28:18, 29:7, 31:2, 31:8, 32:5, 32:17, 34:3, 34:8, 34:16, 35:14, 35:17, 35:21, 36:3, 36:11, 36:15 theory [4] - 3:5, 21:15, 22:13, 26:11 THERAPEUTICS [1] -1.7 therapy [7] - 10:24, 15:13, 15:20, 32:6, 32:10, 32:13, 35:3 they've [2] - 6:2, 7:5 thinking [4] - 16:6, 22:1, 22:3, 26:14 thinks [1] - 19:16 third [2] - 18:13, 19:19 three [6] - 11:22, 12:16, 12:19, 15:25, 24:18, 34:13 three-quarters [1] -24:18 throughout [1] - 20:7 thrust [1] - 15:18 title [1] - 35:16 together [2] - 6:17, 15:1 touched [1] - 30:13 towards [1] - 26:9 transcript [2] - 36:15, 36:19 treat [1] - 22:22 trial [6] - 5:11, 5:14, 5:15, 5:16, 6:6 trials [4] - 4:18, 4:20, 5:6, 6:14 tried [1] - 6:11 Triozzi [1] - 36:21 true [2] - 23:5, 36:18 Trustee [1] - 2:6 try [4] - 7:21, 11:9, 11:10, 16:9 trying [1] - 19:25 Tuesday [1] - 1:11 TUNNELL [1] - 1:19 two [11] - 2:23, 2:24, 4 22, 4 24, 5:4, 10:6, 11:11, 21:19, 31:3,

36:6 type [2] - 17:4, 17:17 types [1] - 17:15

#### U

**U.S** [3] - 28:22, 29:6, 36:22 U.S.D.C.J [1] - 1:14 ultimate [1] - 15:13 unaware [1] - 29:5 under [2] - 13:14, 25:4 underlying [1] - 15:24 understood [1] - 3:7 undertaking [2] -33:13, 33:16 UNITED [1] - 1:1 United [2] - 3:15, 5:2 **University** [1] - 2:6 unless [2] - 4:17, 5:10 unredacted [8] - 2:23, 7:22, 11:11, 11:14, 11:19, 21:3, 21:6, 22:6 up [6] - 3:23, 14:21, 18:20, 19:5, 29:22, 30:5 updated [1] - 6:14 upfront [4] - 22:6, 23:14, 24:18, 28:12 upfronts [1] - 23:25

volumes [1] - 18:3 vs [1] - 2:7

## W

wait [4] - 21:24, 26:12, 27:23, 28:2 warehouse [2] - 4:16, 6.5 ways [1] - 18:19 week [2] - 36:8, 36:10 whole [2] - 10:9, 34:19 wild [1] - 18:25 willing [1] - 18:7 Wilmington [1] - 1:10 wondering [2] - 13:19, 25:22 word [2] - 17:24, 23:9 words [3] - 10:9, 11:16, 21:9 world [1] - 24:20 worth [1] - 25:19 write [1] - 28:8 wrote [1] - 8:11

## Υ

years [5] - 4:23, 4:24, 6:7, 15:25, 26:1 yellow [3] - 11:21, 11:25, 14:11

## V

valuable [1] - 26:16

URQUHART [1] - 1:21

**US** [4] - 5:9, 5:11,

31:16, 31:24

valuation [1] - 28:4 value [12] - 25:17, 27:5, 27:7, 27:11, 27:15, 27:22, 28:25, 29:18, 31:22, 32:1, valued [1] - 27:21 values [1] - 28:9 valuing [1] - 26:17 varieties [1] - 11:23 variety [1] - 29:11 various [2] - 23:10, 31:11 version [15] - 7:22, 8:22, 9:3, 9:22, 12:3, 13:5, 13:15, 14:2, 14:19, 16:15, 18:1, 31:5, 31:8, 35:10, 35:12 versions [2] - 2 24 vial [1] - 5:4 VIII [1] - 13:14